CA2ALZ 3
69B51
c. 2

Vault
19/20

CA2 ALZ 3 1969B51
First Meeting of the Provincial-Municipa
1 Committee on Boundary Changes Fo 2
3 3398 00307 6832

NOV 6 1981
EDMONTON

TRANSCIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FIRST MEETING OF

THE PROVINCIAL-MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE ON BOUNDARY CHANGES

FOR THE

CITY OF EDMONTON

Legislative Building

October 20, 1969

JS
1742
B6 T73
1969

PROVINCIAL-MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE ON BOUNDARY CHANGES
For the
CITY OF EDMONTON

Meeting - October 20, 1969

Meeting of representatives of various municipalities for the purpose of discussing various aspects of boundary changes for the City of Edmonton was held in the Executive Council Chamber of the Legislative Building on Monday, October 20. Meeting was opened by Honourable F. C. Colborne, Chairman of the Joint Committee, at 9:10 a.m.

Those attending were:

Representing	Name	Position
Government of Alberta	Hon. F.C. Colborne	Minister of Municipal Affairs
	Mr. A. W Morrison	Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs
City of Edmonton	Dr. Ivor G. Dent	Mayor
	Dr. Peter F. Bargen	Chief Commissioner
	Mr. D.B. Menzies	Commissioner
Town of Fort Saskatchewan	Mr. B. P. Knowles	Mayor
	Mr. M. A. D. Blore	Councillor
	Mr. J.A. Clark	Manager
Town of St. Albert	Mr. R.M. Gibbon	Mayor
	Prof. J.J. Bakker	Councillor
	Mr. R. G. Wheatley	Councillor
County of Parkland	Mr. Rudolph Zander	Reeve
	Mr. Leslie N. Miller	Councillor
	Mr. Robert A. Bailey	Councillor
	Mr. W. H. Hurlburt	Solicitor

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Legislative Assembly of Alberta - Alberta Legislature Library

https://archive.org/details/ableg_33398003076832_0

epresenting	Name	Position
ounty of Strathcona	Mr. M. R. Parker	Reeve
	Mr. Alf. Hawkins	Secretary
	Mr. Alan M. Brownlee	Solicitor
.D. of Sturgeon	Mr. M.J. William Flynn	Councillor
	Mr. Lawrence C. Kluthe	Councillor
	Mr. George W. Wilson	Councillor
Government Personnel Secretary to the Committee)	Mr. Lorne L. Hurst	Liaison Officer

CHAIRMAN
(Hon. F. C. Colborne)

The purpose of this meeting is to study the matter of boundaries of the City of Edmonton. The City of Edmonton will grow and will need to expand its boundaries. The City has received the Hanson Report and is using some of its information in requesting changes in its boundaries. The Hanson Report has not been adopted by the Government nor has it been formally advanced by the City as the basis of an application for change.

As a first step in recognizing the need for boundary changes, it has been my view, that a meeting such as this, comprising, representatives from Edmonton and its neighbouring and surrounding municipalities, may come to an understanding for changes in boundaries that will serve to meet the needs of Edmonton's growth while also preserving the vital interestes of the smaller municipalities.

Representing	Name	Position
County of Strathcona	Mr. M. R. Parker	Reeve
	Mr. Alf. Hawkins	Secretary
	Mr. Alan M. Bowmaker	Solicitor
M.D. of Sturgeon	Mr. M.L. William Flynn	Councillor
	Mr. Lawrence C. Klutke	Councillor
	Mr. George W. Wilson	Councillor
Government Personnel (Secretary to the Committee)	Mr. Lorne L. Hurst	Liaison Officer

CHAIRMAN
(Hon. F. C. Colborne)

The purpose of this meeting is to study the matter of boundaries of the City of Edmonton. The City of Edmonton will grow and will need to expand its boundaries. The City has received the Hanson Report and is using some of its information in requesting changes in its boundaries. The Hanson Report has not been adopted by the Government nor has it been formally advanced by the City as the basis of an application for change.

As a first step in recognizing the need for boundary changes, it has been my view, that a meeting such as this, comprising, representatives from Edmonton and its neighbouring and surrounding municipalities, may come to an understanding for changes in boundaries that will serve to meet the needs of Edmonton's growth while also preserving the vital interests of the smaller municipalities.

I suppose you could call it a collective bargaining process of some sort, to see if it would be possible to reach an understanding as to what boundaries would be generally acceptable to all concerned. Rather than doing it by the alternative method of reference to some independent body or something of that kind, which, of course is the other alternative, it seem to me. So with that thought in mind, I extended the invitation to representatives of Edmonton, the County of Strathcona, Municipal District of Sturgeon, County of Parkland, Town of Fort Saskatchewan, Town of St. Albert, asking if we could meet to explore the possibilities suggested in the letter. I think I said it might be too much to expect that we could do it this way, but I feel it is worth while trying this approach to the problem before we consider what alternative methods may be open to us.

Perhaps with those preliminary remarks, one of the better ways of getting the meeting under way, may be to go around the table to see if we can get a comment from representatives of the municipal bodies that I mentioned as to their general feeling towards this approach to the problem. If it is agreeable I can take them in the order they appear in this list, which I just read out. First I will ask the City of Edmonton, His Worship the Mayor, or someone delegated by him if he would like to comment on this approach to the problem.

EDMONTON: (Mayor Dent)

Mr. Minister: We are very thankful that you called this meeting and are very glad of the opportunity to attend. I think that your method of approaching this is the best one possible. I also think however, that we have to accept the fact I may represent the only municipality here that says Edmonton does have to grow.

I suppose you could call it a collective bargaining process of some sort, see if it would be possible to reach an understanding as to what boundaries would be mutually acceptable to all concerned. Rather than doing it by the alternative method of reference to some independent body or something of that kind, which, of course is the other alternative, it seems to me. So with this thought in mind, I extended the invitation to representatives of Edmonton, the County of Strathcona, Municipal District of Sturgeon, County of Parkland, Town of Fort Saskatchewan, Town of St. Albert, asking if we could meet to explore the possibilities suggested in the letter. I think I said it might be too much to expect that we could do it this way, but I feel it is worth while trying this approach to the problem before we consider what alternative methods may be open to us.

Perhaps with those preliminary remarks, one of the better ways of getting the meeting under way, may be to go around the table to see if we can get a comment from representatives of the municipal bodies that I mentioned as to their general feeling towards this approach to the problem. If it is agreeable I can take them in the order they appear in this list, which I just read out. First I will ask the City of Edmonton, His Worship the Mayor, or someone delegated by him if he would like to comment on this approach to the problem.

EDMONTON: (Mayor Dant)

Mr. Minister: We are very thankful that you called this meeting and are very glad of the opportunity to attend. I think that your method of approaching this is the best one possible. I also think however, that we have to accept the fact I may represent the only municipality here that says Edmonton does have to grow.

I think that the thing that prejudices me - and I chose the word prejudice - is that I don't believe you can satisfactorily run regional government in a Federal state. I think that adding a fourth level or layer of government our society, makes it almost impossible to move along, and because of this I think that the boundaries of a burgeoning city have to be spread out. I know also that the municipalities surrounding us have their needs and when we annex we do something to them that is not to their betterment in every case. However, I think if we accept the premise that the city has to grow, then I believe with you that we could sit down together and we could decide the way in which the city could grow that would be less detrimental to the surrounding area. And therefore on behalf of the city, I would like to say that we are willing to and anxious to cooperate in every way. I hope that we can reach a solution to this matter and not stay in this situation where we are in conflict for say some two years or so before it's settled, knowing full well that in all probability, the boundaries of the city will change in any event. I think too that it is unwise, in this form of meeting to try to make a municipality such as Edmonton grow or let it grow, by bringing in small parcels here and there because if you are going to retain any quality in your municipality, not only ours, but the surrounding ones, then you have to plan ahead for your growth and for the change that results from this growth. Therefore, we can, if we accept this, change the boundaries of Edmonton and do as little harm as possible to the surrounding municipalities. So, therefore, Mr. Minister, we are only too anxious to cooperate.

I think that the thing that prejudices me - and I chose the word prejudice - is that I don't believe you can satisfactorily run regional government in a Federal state. I think that adding a fourth level or layer of government our society, makes it almost impossible to move along, and because of this I think that the boundaries of a burgeoning city have to be spread out. I know also that the municipalities surrounding us have their needs and when we assess we do something to them that is not to their betterment in every case. However, I think if we accept the premise that the city has to grow, then I believe with you that we could sit down together and we could decide the way in which the city could grow that would be less detrimental to the surrounding area. And therefore on behalf of the city, I would like to say that we are willing to and anxious to cooperate in every way. I hope that we can reach a solution to this matter and not stay in this situation where we are in court for say some two years or so before it's settled, knowing full well that in all probability, the boundaries of the city will change in any event. I think too that it is unwise, in this form of meeting to try to make a municipality such as Edmonton grow or let it grow, by bringing in small parcels here and there because if you are going to retain any quality in your municipality, not only ours, but the surrounding areas, then you have to plan ahead for your growth and for the change that results from this growth. Therefore, we can, if we accept this, change the boundaries of Edmonton and do as little harm as possible to the surrounding municipalities. So, therefore, Mr. Minister, we are only too anxious to cooperate.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Thank you very much, Your Worship.

Before we proceed, Mr. Morrison has reminded me of something I had intended to say before, at the outset of this meeting, and that is to make reference to the news story which you saw in the papers on Friday about a land assembly which the province has completed in cooperation with the city of Edmonton on the southeast boundary of the city. Just to make it clear to everyone, what we are attempting to do out there, I wish to say it has to do with the problem of land costs in the city and the cost of building lots in the city and is not related in any way whatever to the question we are talking about today. It doesn't represent any part or parcel of our thinking with respect to what ought to happen as a result of this meeting. There were some questions asked in the press conference which would lead us to believe that the press were trying to make some connection between the two things, and I want to make it clear to everyone that there was no association between these two things in our minds at all.

Now, the representative of the County of Strathcona.

STRATHCONA: (Reeve Parker)

I agree with Mayor Dent, I think it is worth the try. We are prepared to attend two or three, or more of these hearings to seek a solution. I think our past record has been good as far as cooperating with the city to meet its need for growth or just straight expansion. As for annexation of areas representing industrial or other developments, as everybody knows our ratepayers in no uncertain terms told us they don't want any part of it.

SERAFINOWICZ: (Mr. Colbourn)

Thank [illegible] very much, Your Worship.

Before we proceed, Mr. Morrison has reminded me of something I had [illegible] intended to say before [illegible] he noticed at this meeting, and that is to make reference to the news story which you [illegible] in the papers on Friday about a land assembly which the Province [illegible] completed in cooperation with the city [illegible] Edmonton on the southeast boundary of the city. Just to make it [illegible] to everyone, what we are attempting to do out there, I wish to say it has to do with the problem of land costs in the city and the cost of building lots in the city and is not [illegible] in any way whatever to the question we are talking about tod[illegible] doesn't represent my [illegible] thinking with respect to what ought to happen as a result of this meet[illegible] There [illegible] some questions asked in the press conference which would lead [illegible] believe that the pre[illegible] were trying to make some connection between the two things [illegible] want to make [illegible] clear to everyone that there was no association between these two things in our minds at all.

Mov[illegible] representative of the County of Strathcona.

STRATHCONA: (Reeve Parker)

I agree [illegible] Mayor Dent. I think it is worth the trip. We have proposed to [illegible] two or three, or more of these hearings to seek [illegible] been good as far as cooperating with the city to [illegible] expansion. As for annexation of areas [illegible] knows our ratepayers in no [illegible]

So we are representing Sherwood Park plus the industrial area plus the area outside. If this discussion concerns just straight expansion into undeveloped areas then we are most anxious to cooperate. I think that is about all I need to say at this time.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Since Mr. Parker has high-lighted this aspect of the discussion, I would like to clarify the point with Mayor Dent. Mayor Dent, is it right that Edmonton draws a distinction between the growth of Edmonton into areas which are already developed and those areas which are open for development?

EDMONTON: (Mayor Dent)

Yes.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Perhaps the Municipal District of Sturgeon?

STURGEON: (Mr. Kluthe)

Mr. Chairman, three members of our council are here after being appointed to take part in a round table discussion. The reeve, our leader, isn't present this morning and I think that while there are changes to suggest for municipal boundaries whether they are town boundaries or rural boundaries, they always affect the municipalities they are to deal with. We are prepared to discuss any change in boundaries, at any time, and to sit down with you as suggested in your round table discussion. Sometimes these piecemeal changes are not the best thing and sometimes they are necessary regardless.

We would like to be prepared for our own needs sometime in the future, however. When it is anything beyond a small change then it would affect the economy of the municipality. Thus if the change would include quite a number of miles then it would definitely affect the economy of our municipality and we would have to consider the balance that is left. If we were to go to the extent of some of our reports, our municipalities would be cut to half the population - and almost in half in territory. We would be concerned with what would be left. We are also prepared to take a look at the idea of urban expansion without the change of boundaries. We think that there is some possibility in this area. We have quite an area of our municipality that would lend itself to urban development because it is connected to a city. This area would lend itself in many ways to urban expansion and we feel that there should be some consideration in our talks here on this subject of urban expansion without the change of boundaries, but this may be something to consider within the workings of our own municipal district. If it is your wish to have any comments from our two other representatives -------.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Could I ask a question, Lawrence? You refer to urban expansion without change of boundaries. Are you thinking in terms of something such as has happened at Sherwood Park?

MR. KLUTHE:

It could be a satellite town or it could be expansion right into the municipalities controlled by the municipality that it is in.

MR. PARKER:

That is what we would classify Sherwood Park as being. Sherwood Park was put there about eight miles out and considered a satellite town.

MR. COLBORNE:

It never became a town.

MR. PARKER:

Well, that's right.

MR. COLBORNE:

They would be out of their minds to become a town?

MR. PARKER:

I wouldn't say so. The same as industry. The industry was five miles out but if the city grows that way instead of west then of course they will grow together.

MR. COLBORNE:

Sherwood Park is getting up to, what - 9,000 people now and is still a Hamlet. And they will stay a hamlet as long as they can!

MR. PARKER:

Well, I suppose so.

MR. COLBORNE:

They have no industrial base whatever and theyhave very little or a limited commercial district and they are depending upon the County of Strathcona to provide their streets, street lighting and all the rest of the amenities which they require as an urban center really. You are able to do it in your case because you happen to have a better than average industrial base.

MR. PARKER:

I wouldn't agree with that entirely. They are a hamlet just the same as the other hamlets we have, only bigger. They are in exactly the same position as the Fort as far as schools go. The Fort controls their own schools, municipally. Now Sherwood Park perhaps could do that. If they were to govern their own schools, however, they would be in exactly the same position as before, financially.

MR. COLBORNE:

Yes, I agree with that, although isn't it true that the people there as tax payers would be far worse off if they were to incorporate as a town and try to raise their own money with their limited tax base?

MR. PARKER:

The one thing that I don't think we should forget as far as Sherwood Park goes is that if they were to incorporate they wouldn't have one cent of debt. This is not how these other little towns start up. And they have a real good asset in improvements and municipal services besides. My thinking is, but I don't know that the millrate that goes to pay for municipal debt in other municipalities, would more than make up for anything they lost.

EDMONTON:

Is this open for discussion?

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

I just wanted to clarify that point with respect to urbanization in rural areas. I think we should continue round table and then go back to discussion if you like If that's agreeable. County of Parkland?

I wouldn't agree with that entirely. They are a bonded just like some of other counties we have, only larger. They are in exactly the same position as the as far as schools go. The Fort controls their own schools, municipally. New Park perhaps could do that. If they were to govern their own schools, however, would be in exactly the same position as before, financiall

COLBORNE:

Yes, I agree with that although isn't it true that the people i ld be for worse off if they were to incorpor. in a town and try to run their own with their limit tax base?

Mr. PARKER:

The one thing I can't do is I don't think we should be for Sher oak is that if they were to incorporate they wouldn't have ens ugh left. This is and these other little towns start up. And they have a real good c. e in improvements and legal services besides. My thinking is, but I don't know that the mill rate that goes for municipal debt in other municipalities, would more than make up for anything

PARKLAND (Mr. Zander)

Mr. Minister, we are certainly happy to be here to discuss the expansion of the city. We agree that they must have room to expand but we find ourselves in a unique position as we faced the city last year, about a year ago, over an annexation order saying they required two sections - offered them four sections to square off the boundaries and they said they could't at that time accept it because they couldn't possibly handle that much land. Now land in that area of the proposed annexation is a very likely place for urban development and I don't hingk that any of our County has any objections to it. So we find ourselves a year later and the city wants to acquire a greater amount of land than was offered to them last year and which they said they couldn't use. So I don't know whether things became a little bit different or did it come late or did it come early, we don't know. We were before the Local Authorities Board last year about this time . . . and we opposed the city's annexation of the two sections, saying that they should have four and not the two; and they said "We don't want four, we only want two." And two they got. Frankly, I am amazed at the city's action at this time, saying they require more land when a year ago we offered them more land and they didn't take it. This is our view.

MAYOR DENT:

Mr. Minister, I think that there should be a correction here. Mr. Menzies knows very well about that. We spent two days with Mr. Menzies and he explained why the city couldn't use it then. It would cost $3,000,000 over a five year expansion period to allow this to happen.

(Mr. Zander)

Mr. Minister, we are certainly happy to be here to discuss the expansion city. We agree that they must have room to expand but we find ourselves in a ion or we faced the city last year, about a year ago, over an annexation saying they required two sections - offered the four section to square off the ries and they said they could'. So that time accept it because they couldn't bly handle that much land. Now lon in that area of the proposed annexation is a likely place for urban development and I don't think that any of our County has objections to it. So we find ourselves a year later and the city want to do quite amount of land than was offered. Then last year and which they amount of land than was offered. Then last year and which they

So I don't know whether things been m little bit different or did cause less or it come early, we don't know. We were Local Government here in this time . . . and we opposed the city's annexation of the two they should have four and not the two. the car. We don't not have, ly was " And two they got. Frankly, I am amazed at the city's action at this time, seeing require more land when a year ago we offered them more land and they didn't take This is our view.

DENT:

Mr. Minister, I think that there should be a connection here. Mr. Manzies well about that. We spent two days with Mr. Manzies and he explained why he didn't see it then. 3,000 over a five year expansion period

MR. MENZIES:

Speaking if I may please on my reaction when the request was made from the outside and not from the inside out. That I do not see any objection----- see the doubt----- decided that that property would be the boundary. There were so many things that had to be done in such a short period of time between September and December that I argued in Council very definitely that we should have more time to give consideration to what the ramifications of it were. And it has given us enough trouble now to handle those two sections with the terrific rush that is put on it the minute it comes into the city. The first thing is to get it in and then just work on the Council until you can get it developed and we can only do so much developing. Now I think that there is one thing - I feel that this question of annexation is fundamentally one of government control of who is going to govern the area and the control to see that sporadic developments aren't being taken place all over. And it has been argued that conceivably the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission can do that. I know they could do it if they really want to - if it is sympathetic to the idea that there shouldn't be a great number of Hamlets spring up within two or three months. But ----- because we have enough trouble now trying to get that through.

MR. COLBORNE:

I think we are getting into discussion a little prematurely.

MR. ZANDER:

I still say that our Council is still willing to sit down at any discussion with any body to discuss further expansion of the City of Edmonton.

MR. COLBORNE:

That is appreciated very much. You made some reference to the action, the present actions of the City of Edmonton and just to keep this situation clear. As I understand it, the only action that the City of Edmonton has taken recently is to advance the Hanson Report as a recommended solution to the problem of expansion. Any other action I have initiated myself and I was the one that brought this about recognizing that there had to be some sort of solution to the problem. I wonder if we could just continue a round table and get the comments of the last two representatives here and then we can get to the discussion area in a moment. The Town of Fort Saskatchewan.

FORT SASKATCHEWAN: (Mayor Knowles)

Mr. Minister, I wish to thank you for the invitation to be up here today. We are quite concerned about annexation of course. Our concern is what is going to happen in areas around us. We think that the government should give some thought for our needs when considering changes in boundaries for these areas around us. Any changes in revenue say, in Strathcona, is certainly going to make a difference to our mill rate. We know this because of our school and hospital levies alone.

I would like to make one point. Taking it from you that there is no intention of the government to apply any limitation on the growth and size of Edmonton, it is still a fact that changes in boundaries can only be done through authority of the provincial government. I think our concern would be here. Perhaps the uncertainty can be removed through legislation or something like this.

That is appreciated very much. You made some reference [illegible] action of the City of Edmonton and just to keep this situation clear. As [illegible] stand it, the only action that the City of Edmonton has taken recently is to [illegible] the Hanson Report as a recommended solution to the problem of expansion. [illegible] action I have initiated myself and I was the [illegible] who brought this about. [illegible] there had to be some sort of solution to the p[illegible] [illegible] round table and the comments of [illegible] [illegible] to can get to the discussion [illegible] in a moment [illegible] Fort [illegible]

SASKATCHEWAN: (Mayor Knowles)

Mr. Minister, I wish to thank you [illegible] attention [illegible] up [illegible] are quite concerned about annexation. Of course, [illegible] in areas around us. We thi[illegible] [illegible] about [illegible] when considering economics in [illegible] [illegible] us. An [illegible] a city, in Strathcona, is certainly going [illegible] a difference to our mill rates. [illegible] this because of our school and hospital levi[illegible]

I would like to make one point. Letting it from you that there is no intention to apply any limitation on the growth and size of Edmonton, it is still changes in boundaries can only be done through authority of the provincial [illegible] I think our concern would be here. Perhaps the uncertainty can be removed

MR. COLBORNE:

Well, yes I should comment on that since the question has been raised. Certainly we are prepared as the provincial government to look at any proposals at all that would accomplish, that could accomplish the preventing of urban sprawl - if you like - or the preventing of the continuous growth of cities like Edmonton and Calgary. We would like to see these proposals so as to adopt the practical way of doing it. I don't know of any practical way at the moment. Arbitraily limiting the size of a city to thus far and no farther has been suggested. I see a lot of problems with that approach because this government might say today that Edmonton is not going to go beyond its present boundaries. That's our judgment on the matter that they must be arbitrarily limited to their present size. This doesn't guarantee that this matter of policy is going to last another few years. Another government might come in and under the pressures of arguments against this kind of restriction reverse this situation and away you go again. So even if a government were today to say that these are the boundaries, that doesn't guarantee that a future government isn't going to feel that the boundary is nonsense and lift the restriction again. This is one of the problems that I see about a sort of an arbitrary drawing of a limitation saying that is the way it is going to be. On the other hand, there are other ways of affecting the growth of a large city and urging it in certain directions if you like. This could be through encouraging alternative methods of growth, like satellite cities and this type of thing. I think this approach probably offers more possibilities for doing something that will stick than just trying to arbitrarily by some policy decision

arrive at a fixed size for Edmonton because this fixed size can be changed again. Once you start satellite cities they will have their affect regardless of what anybody does after that action has taken place. So you are doing something that in a sense is permanent. But just to say that arbitrarily by legislation we are going to have a green belt around here doesn't guarantee that the green belt is going to last beyond the next session. That is the problem with that kind of approach it seems to me. But we are certainly interested in exploring all modern ideas and techniques for achieving a better rate of growth, a better or organized and plan growth, or a better limitation of growth - if there is someway of doing it. Is there anyone else form Fort Saskatchewan? The Town of St. Albert then?

ST. ALBERT: (Mayor Gibbon)

Mr. Minister, I would suggest that the Town of St. Albert, as usual is unique in this particular problem. Number one - it is unique because it came under New Town legislation, I won't say at the insistance of your government but with the aid of your government in 1958. You tried to set it up as a satellite town and it in no way can be a satellite town - it is a dormitory town. I will distinguish between the two and give the differences if you like - but I won't go into that now. I would suggest too that a green belt was established at that same time between the City of Edmonton and the Town of St. Albert. On annexation of any kind taking place I would want answers to questions on a number of items. Because of the fact that ....by Sherwood Park and St. Albert are much alike. Because of the fact that if the City of Edmonton is going to annex as under the Hanson Report, we will be left as a back- water for some time to come.

a fixed size for Edmonton because this fixed size can be changed again. Once that satellite cities they will have their effect regardless of what anybody does after action has taken place. So you are doing something that in a sense is permanent just to say that arbitrarily by legislation we are going to have a green belt around doesn't guarantee that the green belt is going a last beyond the next session. That the problem with that kind of approach it seems to me. But we are certainly into actual exploring all modern ideas and techniques in conceiving a better way to growth or organized and plan growth, or a better limitation growth - it may be someone doing it. If there anyone else from Fort Saskatchewan if the town of St. Albert then? . ALBERT : (Mayor Gibbon)

Mr. Minister, would you agree that one of St. Albert's problems in this particular problem. My [illegible] because [illegible] legislation, I won't say of the instance of our government but with the old government in 1958. You tried to [illegible] it up as a satellite town [illegible] in so far as a satellite town - it is a dormitory [illegible] I will distinguish between two and two differences if you like - but I won't go into that now. [illegible] would suggest too that a green was established at that same time between the City of Edmonton and the Town of Albert. On annexation of any kind taking place I would want answers to questions as on a items. Because of the fact that ....by Sherwood Park and St. Albert are much [illegible] of the fact that if the City of Edmonton [illegible] to annex as under the [illegible] we will be left as a bar [illegible] water for some time to come.

I would have to have some guarantees that our servicing, proper facilities and everything else was going to be continued in particularly my town in any case. Sherwood Park is another question - this is for the County of Strathcona to worry about. I feel that you mentioned the tax base - I feel that with the control that we have in St. Albert presently under our financial system, that the city of Edmonton will in all probability surpass our mill rate in time to come. This is just a belief of mine, Mr. Minister. We presently have an 80 mill rate and city of Edmonton has a 66, and they have approximately 18 mills, although I see that profit is increasing on that of their utilities. I would suggest that the Town of St. Albert, regardless of the fact that it may be classified as urban sprawl, is in a happy situation that we are a small town, the people enjoy it - the majority of them, and I would think that you are going to have to be careful before the urban sprawl catches us. This is all I have to say. I think my two councillors would have something to add because we are definitely a split council and I think that this is probably best - you find better government this way. I have Councillor Bakker and Councillor Wheatly with me and I think they can give additional comment.

PROFESSOR BAKKER:

Mr. Minister, I have expressed a somewhat different point of view from time to time but the only factor that I was wanting to point out is the question of profitable utilities. One main reason for the present tax gap between St. Albert and Edmonton is that Edmonton has profitable utilities, St. Albert has unprofitable utilities. The most profitable utility in the City of Edmonton, I believe, is Edmonton Power, which apparently, and we see this in the paper from time to time, represents 15 mills and reduces the

must have to have some guarantees that our schools, proper facilities and everything

is was going to be continued in particularly my town in any case. Sherwood Park

[illegible] question - this is for the County of Strathcona to [illegible] about I feel that

mentioned the tax base - I feel that with the [illegible] that we have in S[illegible] Park

under our financial system, that the city of Edmonton will in all probability [illegible]

[illegible] in time to come. This is just a belief of mine [illegible] Mr. Minister. We presently

on 80 mill rate and city [illegible] Edmonton has a [illegible] approximately [illegible] will

see that profit is increasing on that [illegible] utilit[illegible] would say [illegible] that

[illegible] Albert, regardless of the fact that it [illegible] gravel [illegible] urban sprawl, is in a

y situation that we [illegible] all town, the people [illegible] the majority of them, and

think that you are going to have [illegible] be can [illegible] later the urban sprawl concern [illegible] us

is all I have to say. I think my two colleagues [illegible] have something [illegible]

are definitely a split council and I think that this [illegible] probably best [illegible] you [illegible] with

this way. I have Councillor Baker and Councillor Wheatly with [illegible] and I

they can give additional comment.

ESSOR BAKER:

Mr. Minister, I have expressed a somewhat different point of view from time

but the only factor that I was wanting to point out is the question of profitable

[illegible] reason for the present tax gap between St. Albert and Edmonton is

[illegible] profitable utilities, St. Albert has unprofitable utilities. The cost

[illegible] of Edmonton, [illegible] lower which [illegible]

[illegible] is the

taxation of the average house maybe $100.00 per year. In St. Albert we only have municipally owned utilities - water and sewer - at no profit and Calgary Power services our town for electricity and so altogether we have no utility profits. Utilities, particulary the water costs more than is levied. We have had a survey done by a consulting firm which came to the conclusion about last January that the average cost to an average family with a three-bedroom home in St. Albert as compared with Edmonton was about $25.00 a month more. This is compared with higher taxes and higher utilities and for what it is worth, a plebiscite held last February or January in the town showed a narrow margin in favour of annexation purposes. Conditions are changing very rapidly and there are a lot of people who wouldn't want to lose the local control, on the other hand there are a lot of people who would be very interested in immediate reductions in taxes and utilities.

The town of St. Albert is sometimes like the defined Dutchman- if you have four Dutchmen you have five religions and six political parties and in the Town of St. Albert, if you count the three from the Council you probably have four or five opinions. I regret, Mr. Minister that the school boards were not invited because they are such a vital part of the picture.

In this situation, I think you will find the town can exercise far better municipal control than they are able to do apparently in the educational field. And our tax increases are thus due to the fact that any extra money required are not the foundation plan. It is from residential assessment, and school finances, as has been suggested on numerous occasions should be no longer be dependent upon the property taxes

the average house may be $100.00 per year. In St. Albert we only have owned utilities - water and sewer - at no profit and Calgary Power services for electricity and so altogether we have a utility profits. Utilities, particular costs more than is levied. We now had a survey done by a consultation firm came to the conclusion about last January that the average cost to an average y with a three-bedroom house in St. Albert as compared with Edmonton was about .00 a month more. This is compared with higher taxes and higher utilities and is well worth, a plebiscite held last February or January in Bel[illegible] showed a narrow margin of annexation pur[illegible]. Conditions are changing rapidly and there of people who would [illegible] local control on the other hand of people who would be very interested in [illegible]

The town of St. Albert is something like the defined Dutchman. If you have four Dutchmen you have five religions and [illegible] political parties and [illegible] Albert, if you count the [illegible] from the Council you [illegible] probably have four or five. I regret, Mr. Minister, that the school boards [illegible] invited be[illegible] as they are [illegible] a vital part of the picture.

In this situation, I think you will find the town can appreciate far better [illegible]pal control than they are able to do apparently in the educational field. And [illegible] increases are thus due to the [illegible] that very extra money requires or not the

other than perhaps to calculate in the foundation plan. We would thus be in a somewhat different situation I think than we are at the present time in our difference in our difference of taxes considering the controls that we have instituted and the municipal services that they have to be concerned with. On the municipal level this can be quite well done. At the educational level if it is dependent upon property taxes there may be difficulties, however there is a more widespread feeling, even in the City of Edmonton, that probably the educational levy should not be a charge against property but perhaps a charge against people. Another point that I'd like to make is that I think we are in need of certain regional government. We already have it in the case of planning through the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission, where we have one civil service - the Regional Planning Commission serving quite a few communities and municipalities. Basically, I feel we are in need of the regional government which Mayor Dent so blithely rejects without giving any reason. I feel the need of it because at a local government level we have local envolvement and the more central we make the city, the less local involvement we get and we will also get the annexation problems and proposals associated with the remnants that are left. Personally I feel that we are in need of regional government to look after such things as utilities, parks, protection to personal property, planning, transportation and thelike. Probably if incorporating the entire area of the municipalities invited here today, perhaps we should add Leduc. However I also think that there is an involvement needed locally as far as local planning is concerned. Although it may be decided that St. Albert should be residential, I do think that at the local level it should also be decided whether it should be high density or low density.

perhaps to calculate in the foundation plan. We would thus be in a somewhat

tion I think then we are at the present time in a difference in

of taxes considering the controls that we have instituted and the

that they have to be concerned with. On the municipal level this can be a

done. At the educational level if it is decided property there may

difficulties, however there is a more widespread feeling in the

probably the educational levy should not be charged against property but pe

against people. Another point that I'd like to the initial we

regional government. We dread have it. The planning

Regional Planning Commission, a new municipal service

Commission serving quite a few municipalities. Besides

we are in need of the regional government which

any reason. I feel the need that a local

involvement and the more control made in city. The local government

get and we will also get the annexation problem particularly case in

are left. Personally I feel that there is no need regional government to

offer such things as utilities, parks, protection to property, planning

and the like. Probably if incorporating the entire area of the municipalities

perhaps we should add Leduc. However I also think that there is an

local, as far as local planning is concerned. Although it may be

ial think that at the local level it would

If recreation is provided locally it might cause more local participation, and in such things as local maintenance, we have the feeling and suspicion that perhaps if we become part of Edmonton that our snow plow would be used on Groat Road or some downtown Edmonton area and we wouldn't see the necessary equipment until some considerable time later and even such things of local operation as sanitation removal and the like. And the secret I think with making regional government acceptable and compatible also with local government, would be if we could have a common civil service between them all. In other words, that the civil service be part of one unit. That the civil service serve several elected bodies whose jurisdictions had specified responsibilities. In which case the local councils could be retained to a large extent and perhaps even expanded and have centralization within the city of Edmonton. This local government role might make a little bit more community involvement versus the seeming vastness of city government. I think if it was approached on that basis, one would have perhaps a chance of making growth of Edmonton quite acceptable in all directions when necessary, although this growth is greatly exaggerated because we are increasing density all the time, and therefore the amount of land that Edmonton will need will be less and less per person that is added. Incidentally, I think it is an advantage in a federal-provincial context to have competition between the various governments which we have in the Edmonton region. One disadvantage for Edmonton has been high prices of land which does have an affect as to how far that land is available in other municipalities where at they operate on a different systmes of developments. Like the developer having to put in everything. It becomes perhaps more attractive for the developers to move to neighbouring municipalities and thereby reduce the pressure on prices in the city of Edmonton.

This was the very reason why St. Albert became a new town in the first place. But I think that the terms on which this meeting has been called therefore - on which you say it is either piecemeal annexation or the approach advocated by the Hanson Report, and then you say just the only alternative will be to put the question to some government authorized board of tribunal, etc. I do feel that we should recognize that regional government should also be an alternative that this alternative should not be ignored or rejected because the city of Edmonton feels that it should be rejected.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Well, now is there any further comment or response anyone would like to make to comments that we have heard now having to do with whether or not we can attempt to get together to draw boundaries.

EDMONTON:

Mr. Chairman, to come back to the question raised by County of Parkland questionning if there was waste regarding the annexation of a few sections - I think perhaps it touched upon a very basic principle that is involved in the city's problem and I think the answer as to why they insisted on the two sections rather than four is quite simple from one perspective. And that is, this is the difference between piecemeal annexation when the city is pressed for land, and a larger annexation - it doesn't have to be the Hanson proposal but something in that magnitude, that when pressure was put on Council to annex west of the city, the result was the immediate hiking of prices of the land in the area to be annexed and whether that is two sections or four sections the land had gone up in price.

was the very reason why St. Albert became a new town in the first place. But that the terms on which this meeting has been called therefore - on which a either piecemeal annexation or the approval advocated by the Hanson Report - then say just the only alternative will be to go the question to some new arrangement with the Tribunal, etc. I do feel that we the representatives of rural municipalities be on elite notice that this alternative and [illegible] rural or semi-rural [illegible] of Edmonton feels that it should be rejected.

MAYOR (Mr. Colborne)

Well, now is the time for us to [illegible] comments that we have had now [illegible] get together to draw boundaries.

COMMISSIONER:

Mr. Chairman, [illegible] raised [illegible] attending if there would be a meeting [illegible] touched upon a very basic principle the [illegible] answer as to why they insisted [illegible] two sections in [illegible] than four 6 quarts square from [illegible] tive. And that is, this is the difference between piecemeal [illegible] tion when [illegible] is proposed for land, and a larger annexation - it doesn't have to be the Hanson [illegible] but something in that magnitude, that when pressure was put on Council to [illegible] the result was the immediate hiking of prices of the land in the area to be [illegible] in two or four sections the land had gone up in price.

Where we could get land prior to annexation for $4,500.00 an acre and after annexation they are asking $15,000 to $18,000 an acre. So this would have been expanded to four sections with the same thing because the annexation itself, either two or four was not large enough to look after this problem. And this was I think the reason why the city did not press for more land at that time, because the total project was not big enough to have any affect and this is exactly the disadvantage of piecemeal annexation. But if we are pressed for land, the prices are higher and immediately as soon as we take a section or two sections the prices are hiked - tripled to what they were in the beginning. And taking the four sections would have done nothing but create additional pressures on the city council to service that land which we didn't have the money to do. We may be able to get two sections but not four. So it was looked at very narrowly I quite grant you, but this has nothing to do with the larger terms of annexation, for example what happened in Calgary a while back where they have 150 sq. miles roughly and you don't find that type of pressure because the city can move in any direction. We annex these two sections and we know that that is where we have got to go - there is no other place. And therefore the land prices go up. I thought I would add this comment to make it perhaps a little more understandable to the County of Parkland. We would have been interested if that area would have been larger than four sections by far, but we can absorb as little asspossible at the moment.

PARKLAND:

The County of Parkland agrees with the proposition that the city should have land for residential expansion and this is what we are not only willing but anxious to talk with them about if we are ever able to talk. We do feel a little surprise that the council says it cannot control the people, people in the areas wanting to have residential expansion.

. would get land prior to annexation to [illegible] $4,500.00 an acre and after annexation they
re asking $10,000 to $18,000 an acre. So this would have be[illegible] expanded to four sections
n the same [illegible]ing because the annexation itself, either two or four was not large enough
[illegible] after this problem. And this was I think one reason why [illegible]ally did not press to
re land at that time, because the tot[illegible] project was not big enough to have any effect
is exactly the disadvantage of piecemeal annexation. [illegible] are pressed for land,
ces are higher and immediately as soon as [illegible] take a section [illegible] sections the prices
[illegible] inflated to what they were in the beginning. And again the four sections would
[illegible] nothing but create additional pressure [illegible] sewer, but
[illegible] we didn't have it a month [illegible] ago, we may [illegible] sections out and four
it was located at very narrow [illegible] quite q[illegible] this be referred to as [illegible] R 2 h
of annexation, for example what h[illegible] in Zale [illegible] and where is [illegible] 13
miles roughly and you can tell [illegible] that type of pressure [illegible] on any
[illegible]. We annex them [illegible]tions and [illegible] know the that is wh[illegible] have go[illegible]
is no other place. And therefore the land prices go up. [illegible] would [illegible]
to make it perhaps a little more understandable to the County of Parkland. We
ld have been interested if that area would have been larger than four sections by far,
[illegible] can absorb as little as possible at the moment.

The County of Parkland agrees with the proposition that the city should have
[illegible] expansion. This is what we are not only willing but anxious to talk
[illegible]. We do feel a li[illegible]
[illegible] areas wanting to

STURGEON:

A follow up question, Mr. Minister. If the city were to acquire additional large parcels of land from the municipality, probably as large as the Hanson Report has suggested or even a lesser amount, I am wondering what would happen - talking about a long period haul, I am just wondering what would happen to this land that was brought into the city under annexation between the time it was annexed and the time that it was going to be developed. It gives me some concern as to what is going to happen to this land. I remember we have a lot of people living in these areas that certainly have to have some consideration - people who are living there, third and fourth generations. They are wondering whether they should sell the land to a speculator at a fairly good price or whether they should hold onto it. I think a lot of our residents in our municipalities are very, very, concerned and confused by what is going to happen to the land if such a thing takes place. And personally I would like some answers to this. What is going to happen to this land if it is annexed - great amounts. If it is just going to sit there for let's say 15 or 20 years as suggested until the city finds the use for it - what is going to happen?

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

A very good question and is certainly one that has to be settled. We have the example of a similar kind of large scale annexation done in the city of Calgary, maybe Mr. Morrison could explain how that worked out.

MR. MORRISON:

The Local Authorities Board, as the agency that dealt with the annexation, did provide in their order that certain conditions would apply. For example, the assessment now applicable, at least applicable in the area before annexation,

would continue to apply within the new city boundary until the land was subdivided or utility services were to be provided so that the property owner living in an annexed area which might not be needed for urban development for 10 or 15 years is protected as far as assessment and taxation is concerned. The city has the choice at any time, however, to put in an application to the agency that provides for annexation now, which of course if the Local Authorities Board to vary the assessment or taxation picture. But normally the Local Authorities Board will not vary it unless there are services provided or a subdivision is to take place or has taken place. With respect to the use that a person makes of this property, the zoning of it for example, I don't see that this would really have any great effect whether it was in the city or in the County of Parkland or the MD of Sturgeon. If no means can be found and I doubt that they are likely to be found, to stop the city from growing, it is inevitable that the city will have to expand in certain directions in any event, so that whether it stays in the MD of Sturgeon or the County of Parkland or wherever it might be, the zoning will have to follow the development of the area. The fact that a person is a third or fourth generation Canadian land owner in the area indicates to me of course, that he is not a land speculator himself, so maybe he only wants to get the value out of his land because of the development taking place. But I think it has to be pointed out here that if there is a relatively small annexation, then the price of land automatically increases just by the mere fact that it is now in the city. People anticipate therefore that the land is going to be immediately subdivided and development take place. This raises the price of land.

to apply within the new city boundary until the land has subdivided or services were to be provided so that the property owner-living in an annexed area might not be needed for urban development for 10, or 15 years is protected as and taxation is considered. The city has the choice at any time, however, on application to the agency that provides for annexation now, which is course the Local Authorities Board to vary the assessment or taxation pattern. But normally the Authorities Board will not vary it unless there are services provided or such a place or has taken place. With respect to this use that a person makes of this zoning of it for example, I don't [illegible] that this would [illegible] It was in the city or in the County or Parkland [illegible] MD or Sh[illegible] means can be found and I doubt that they [illegible] be [illegible] to [illegible] growing, it is inevitable that the city will have to expand in certain [illegible] so that whether it stays in the MD of Sturgeon or [illegible] of Parkland or [illegible] be, the zoning will have to follow the development in the area. The is a third or fourth generation [illegible] land owner in the area [illegible] to a that he is not a land speculator himself, so maybe he only wants to [illegible] the value land because of the development taking place. But I think it has to be pointed the there is a relatively small annexation, then the price of land automatically more fact that it is now in the city. People anticipate therefore that [illegible] [illegible] land subdivide and development take place. This raises

QUESTIONER:

Mr. Morrison, does this mean that annexation would mean freezing of the land if you cannot sell?

MR. MORRISON:

No.

QUESTIONER:

Well what is to stop a man from selling a section of land for an exorbitant price and by the time the city gets there even though it is under annexation, the profit would be as high as it is now in the adjoining area. What is there to stop this. This is the thing that I just don't understand.

MR. MORRISON

There is nothing to stop it except the wisdom of the city itself as to how it counteracts this kind of action. I think for example that the way in which the city could protect itself would be to acquire some of this land itself and be ready to market it in competition with developers who are pushing prices.

QUESTIONER:

Re the Hanson Report. Landowners in the area proposed for annexation are pretty intelligent people I believe and many a one of them is asking "what is going to happen to me if this takes place? Am I going to be able to sell my land?" A lot of them are in their 70's and 80's. They want to sell this land as quickly as they possibly can in order to get some good out of it for their few days left and . . .

MR. MORRISON:

There is nothing to prevent them from selling their land.

QUESTIONER:

So then a speculator could come in and buy their land which has already been annexed by the city. And this procedure could drive the price up so that it would defeat the purpose of annexation really.

MR. MORRISON:

Well, whether it would drive the price of land up would depend on how much other land was going to be marketed at reasonable prices so that the guy that pays the exhorbitant price loses money.

EDMONTON:

Mr. Minister, the answer to this is to have a great amount of land. It is obvious that we don t have to sub-divide and can't service in every direction at once. Now therefore, where the land is driven up to an exhorbitant price we don't move in that direction obviously because it is not economical to do so. But here is land competition for people to get their land marketed and this would have a tendency to control the price of land far greater than is possible now. We take the two sections west of the city, we can expand no place else, then that becomes extremely valuable land and we have no alternative direction which we can go. However, if we have ten alternative directions then the speculator who is holding land and has paid an exorbitant price for it has to start to think in terms of whether he can afford the interest in that investment or whether he can reduce the price for the market.

There is nothing to prevent them from selling the li

So then [illegible] later could come in and say, that land which was already annexed by the city. And this procedure could drive [illegible] prices up so that it would [illegible] the purpose of annexation really.

MORRISON:

Well, whether it would drive the price [illegible] depend on how other land was going to be market[illegible] reasonable [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Because of this you do get some real competition in the marketing of land and this ha a tendancy to control, --but with piecemeal annexation you cannot have ...

CHAIRMAN(Mr. Colborne)

This is partly demonstrated in the instance of Calgary.

EDMONTON:

I cannot buy that either, Mr. Minister, just following it up, even if the city owned all the land in Northern Alberta, the minute they said we are going to run a new sub-division and plan this a year ahead, or even two years ahead, you may as well start trading anyhow and maybe they will say we are going out here and they will start trading there too and so some speculator is going to lose his shirt over here because another speculator is going to pick it up and so this proposal is not going to change the situation one iota.

I think the point that Mayor Dent planned to convey was that if they only have one direction to move and a limited amount of land, that they can service, then this is insufficent to meet the total demand. If they are observed to move in several directions at once and they can service and market enough land, then they can keep seeing that the demand for land is met by supply.

QUESTIONER:

They cannot service enough land, this is the whole problem.

QUESTIONER:

They have indicated that.

24 this you do get some real competition in the marketing of land and this be

to control, --but with piecemeal dove- tion you cannot have

AN(Mr. Colborne)

This is really demonstrated in the instance of Col-

Cov. I cannot buy that either Mr. Minister, at least

y owned all the land in Northern Alberta, the minute the said we [illegible] ing [illegible]

sub-division and plan this a year ahead [illegible] even two years ahead you may as well

anyhow and maybe they will say we are going out [illegible] and [illegible]

there too and so some speculator is going to have bi [illegible]

is going to pick it up and so this proposal is not going to change the [illegible]

I think the point that Mayor Dent [illegible] never [illegible] that if they only

one direction to move and a limited amount [illegible] land, that they are [illegible] then the

to meet the total demand. If they are observed to move in several directions

they can service and market enough land, then they can keep saying that the

land is met by supply.

They cannot service enough land, this is the whole problem.

EDMONTON.

Mr. Minister, I think we have to have another dimension and that we also buy certain land and hold it and we always have the alternative of going toward other land if the price is unreasonable in other places. And therefore, if we maintain on our own land a reasonable mark up and make certain that this is maintained, the others have to come close to this or else they don't have marketable land. And as a matter of fact, the city had began this before the province assisted us in making this latest purchase and now right or wrong, we feel that we have this control. Now if we continue on doing this it is obvious we are going to get the kind of control that the city of Saskatoon has long had in this area. The city of Saskatoon has been marketing land for lots at a reasonable price. Because it didn't allow all of the land to get away from it as this city had done.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Could we get down to a discussion on what way we are going to arrive at a plan of which way the city, or what land the city requires. Is the city intending on going ahead with the Hanson Report or are they looking at a different land area other than the Hanson Report?

EDMONTON:

Well, Mr. Minister, we are at this meeting because we are not intending to go ahead immediately with the Hanson Report. We are much more interested in following the Minister's suggestion. We are now going into a kind of situation that is going to last for years and the Hanson Report is all it takes, it looks at the economics, political situation that would give us, according to Dr. Hanson, the best possible governmental unit for Edmonton.

Mr. Minister, I think we have to have another dimension

land and hold it and we always have the different [illegible] going to need an [illegible] land

price is unreasonable in other places. And therefore, [illegible] maintain [illegible] own land

mark up and make certain that this is maintained [illegible] they have [illegible] come

this or else they don't have marketable land. And [illegible] in fact, [illegible] this most

before the previous assisted us in making this latest sure [illegible] and no [illegible]

we feel that we have this control. Now if [illegible] can join [illegible] in a [illegible]

to get the kind of control the city of Saskatoon h[illegible] had i[illegible] this

city of Saskatoon has been marketing land for [illegible] reasonable [illegible] [illegible]

all of the land to get over from it as this city had done.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Collomo)

Could we get down to a discussi[illegible]

[illegible] way the city, or what land the city requires. Is the city intending [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the Hanson Report or are they looking at a different land [illegible] than the

[illegible] Report?

[illegible]

[illegible] Well, Mr. Minister, we are at this meeting because we are not intending to

[illegible] with the Hanson Report. We are much more interested in following

We are [illegible] going [illegible] a kind of situation that is going to last for

[illegible] of the economics, political situation

We realize that when we take Edmonton's case we are not necessarily taking all the sides into account. We are not thinking in terms of what will be left for the surrounding municipalities. So what we would like is to follow the Minister's suggestion and get together with our neighbours and look at this so that we can look at the extension of our boundaries at the same time as the surrounding municipalities are looking at their own economic and political need so that they won't be destroyed by the expansion.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr Colborne)

Edmonton is saying that they are prepared to vary from the Hanson Report in order to find a mutually acceptable ....

QUESTIONER:

Well I was under the assumption, Mr. Minister, that we are talking about the Hanson Report now I don't know what the hell we are talking about.

CHAIRMAN (MR. Colborne)

Well,

QUESTIONER:

I am not prepared to sit here and discuss something that I have no knowledge of.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Well, I don't know how much knowledge you have on the Hanson Report....? No, it is probably my fault. I should have said at the beginning that as far as I am concerned the Hanson Report is a report that was commissioned by the city of Edmonton and was prepared for the city of Edmonton and I can't look on it in any other way as the case which might

be presented by the city of Edmonton if this matter were to be settled by the Local Authorities Board or some other board of arbitration. This is what Edmonton would say to the Board. This is what, --this is the way, we think this question ought to be settled.

The city of Edmonton has presented the Hanson Report to the provincial Government, but I don't recognize any responsibility on the part of the provincial government to accept the Hanson Report, to deal with it any other way than to look at it and consider it as what Edmonton may be saying is the answer to the problem. What I have said is that I am not prepared to refer the Hanson Report as such to the Local Authorities Board or anyone else at this point. But I am prepared, if necessary, to refer the question as to how the necessary rules that Edmonton should be accomodated to the Local Authorities Board or some other arbitration board. So I draw a distinction between solving the question of how Edmonton should expand and how the new boundaries should be drawn. And the Hanson Report as such reports only one possibility whereas I think there are many possibilities with respect to how to solve the problem.

QUESTIONER:

Mr. Minister, you mentioned at the start of your--pretty well at the start about this annexation --not annexation, but purchase of land by the provincial government and the city of Edmonton to the south. Now this is already an established fact, is that right? There is also a second area under discussion between the city of Edmonton and B.A.C.M. just to the north, between 97th and 127th streets. These are both fairly vast areas.

by the city of Edmonton if this w

Board or some other board of arbitration. This is what [illegible] section [illegible] board. This is what, --this is the way, we think this [illegible]

The city of Edmonton is presented [illegible] provided [illegible] consent, but I don't recognize any responsibility [illegible] provincial [illegible] to accept the Hanson Report, to deal with it any [illegible] as what Edmonton may be saying is the answer to [illegible] prepare. What I [illegible] is not prepared to refer the Hanson Report [illegible] at this point. But I am prepared, if necessary rules that Edmonton should be accommodated [illegible] the [illegible] some other arbitration board. So I am [illegible] what [illegible] should expand and how the new boundaries should [illegible] as such reports only one possibility where I [illegible] then [illegible] you [illegible] if [illegible] to how to solve the probl

QUESTION PERIOD:

[illegible] Mr. Minister you mentioned at the start of [illegible] very well at the start [illegible] annexation --not annexation, but purchase at land by the provincial government [illegible] the city of Edmonton to the south. Now this is already an established fact, is that [illegible] area under discussion between the city of Edmonton and [illegible] streets. These are both fairly

This is my interpretation of that of course and I wonder, is this considered by the city of Edmonton to be annexation or is it a large enough area to really come up with? The report for instance, mentions that you would be putting on the block approximately 300 to 500 lots a year, I think it was. Is that not correct Mayor Dent?

EDMONTON:

Half a section to three-quarters section, there are about four lots in an acre. Or more than that.

QUESTIONER:

The paper mentions that this might be.

EDMONTON:

Three-quarter of a section.

QUESTIONER:

I just wonder what sort of impact that would have.

ANOTHER QUESTIONER:

Mr. Minister, are we not entitled to an explation on this? First the act clearly specifies that you can't go and buy land in another government jurisdiction without consulting them. This was not done.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

He is not buying it.

QUESTIONER:

Well doesn't this government?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

We did it, it is our land.

QUESTIONER:

But obviously you have talked to the city. You did not just go out and buy land without talking to the city about buying land.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

That is right.

QUESTIONER:

It is for the city and it is in the county of Strathcona. Now certainly they should have been consulted and if this is the way it is going that the government and the city are going to decide, they are going to have this and the government is going to buy it for them, then if this is policy, we are wasting our time aren't we?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Well, I don't think so. I don't think there is any real relationship between the two questions. What we were attempting to do in the acquisition of this land was to deal with a serious situation which Edmonton faces with respect to building lots. It is a solution to the housing problem and we were thinking in terms of the people who are having difficulty finding housing within reach of their incomes. It has nothing to do with this situation.

MIXED DISCUSSION:

Its don't want annexation then you sure got a mess on your hands. I can still say so.

Then there is about land that they have nothing to do with it.

Well we won't use any money on land I am quite satisfied with that.

Not at all.

So obviously you have talked to the city. You did not just go out and without talking to the city about buying land.

(Mr. Colborne)

[illegible] That is right.

It is for the city and it is in [illegible] Society of School have been consulted on it. If this is the way it is going that the city [illegible] going to decide, they are going to [illegible] it for them, then if this is policy, we are wasting our time [illegible] we

(Mr. Colborne)

[illegible] Well, I don't think so. I don't think there is [illegible] questions. What we were attempting to do in the acquisition of this land [illegible] serious situation which Edmonton faces with respect to [illegible] to the housing problem and we were thinking in terms of [illegible] difficulty finding housing within reach of their incomes. It has nothing to do with

don't want annexation

then you were

I can still say so.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

We could not have consulted with the County of Strathcona and accomplished what we are attempting to do anyhow. It is very important in this whole matter that we consulted as few people as possible and as a matter of fact I was amazed that we accomplished what we did accomplish without the matter becoming common knowledge and speculators getting in on the act.

STURGEON:

Well, I have to say, Mr. Minister, I came here this morning with some apprehension, after reading the report in the paper. I would have to say that this meeting is a kind of anti-climax now because there is no doubt in my mind that if the city (not the province) would have purchased this land, they would have had to come to the municipality concerned and I am not going to question the provincial financing or anything else but this looks like a conspiracy between the two authorities to get around the municipality without having to go to the Act (such as the government made and I must say that I came here as a member of a committee from Sturgeon with some apprehension this morning.) Is this going to happen to us? If this is what is going to happen, if the city is going to get land by the instrument of the government without having to go through the channels that are really law and governmental law, then I feel the same as this gentleman here. I think it is unfortunate that the announcement was not delayed until this meeting today.

We could not have consulted with the County of Strathcona and what we are attempting to do anyhow. It is very important in this whole that we consulted as few people as possible and as a matter of fact I was amazed we accomplished what we did accomplish without the matter becoming common knowledge speculators getting in on the act.

Well, I have to say, Mr. Minister, I came here this morning still after reading the report in the paper. I would have to say that it seemed kind of anti-climax now because there is no doubt in my mind that if would have purchased this land, they would have had concerned and I am not going to question the provincial but this looks like a conspiracy between the two authorities to get around the without having to go to the Act (such as the government made - and I must come here as a member of a committee from Stuyvesan with some consideration) is this going to happen to us? If this is what is going to happen, if the city to get land by the instrument of the government without having to go through are really low and governmental law, then I feel the same as this man here. I think unfortunately the announcement was not delayed until this

CHAIRMAN: (Mr Colborne)

Well, it might have been a better situation if that had been the case, but I can't hardly agree that that is the approach. We in fact, as far as this matter is concerned, had nothing to hide other than the necessity of keeping the thing confidential until such time as we had accomplished what we were out to do. I would say this to you, that if we can find a way of setting new boundaries for the city of Edmonton which would take care of its growth in the foreseeable future then we would not be faced with this situation. And the only reason we were faced with the situation you are complaining about now is the fact that Edmonton had no place to go. If there was growing space, there would have been no need for going out and doing what we had to do in this instance.

QUESTIONER:

Mr. Minister, has the city of Edmonton ever been refused annexation?

CHAIRMAN:

No, I don't think so, this is why I wouldn't be so concerned about the question now being raised because I am quite satisfied . . . . .

QUESTIONER:

According to a report in the paper, the land bought was east to 42nd street.

INTERJECTION:

---Mr. Minister --about 38th street.

INTERJECTION:

---Somebody else is speculating already then, as I understand a recent purchase has been made just outside this area.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

A couple of purchases were made in which land spilled over the boundary from the land we were after. It was a matter of having to take the whole parcel in order to get the piece within the boundary that we were after. It is likely your information concerns this type of purchase. The whole exercise was to stop land speculation. We did not consult with anyone except the city. The city did not make the purchase because they would have to go to the County of Strathcona and so increase the likelihood of others knowing about the intention.

We had no reason to suspect that we could not consult with the council of Strathcona and still have it confidential. Just as we could have consulted with the city council of Edmonton and brought all the Aldermen into knowledge of the situation. I could have consulted with the whole cabinet which I did not even do in this instance in order to proceed with this. Such consultations would have multiplied the number of people who could have been responsible for spilling the beans on the deal and ruining it and it was not a smart thing or a wise thing to do.

The fact that we keep information of this kind to a small group of people should not be interpreted as meaning that we don't trust the others.

QUESTIONER:

Whose money was spent?

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

AHURC money.

DR. BARGEN:

Mr. Minister, I think it should be explained here, that when you are working with the press everyday and when you get more and more people who know about this, then you are going to have one of them trick someone to make a chance remark, and the whole thing will be public and once it thus becomes public it is impossible to meet our objectives. Now our city council was not consulted and it is impossible as a matter of fact, to go around and make full consultations and to keep this thing quiet. It has happened to us too often when we have consulted with our own council only to have some press person start to play one off against the other and get full revelation of what is going on and you can't possibly succeed particularly in the purchase of land. If too many people know about it, and it is not a case of honesty at all, it soon is seen the way the press takes it.

QUESTIONER:

Do you mean to tell me that the Province of Alberta bought half the city of Edmonton without the knowledge of city council?

DR. BARGEN:

Yes. There were only a few knew about it. That was Mr. Colborne, myself, the Mayor of Edmonton and Mr. Orysiuk of A.H.U.R.C.

QUESTIONER:

Well I think perhaps we should clarify that point. It is easy to use government money that way if that is what you are intent on doing. In any event, I can't imagine the province spending provincial taxpayers money to buy land for the city of Edmonton which the city council didn't even know about.

Mr. Minister, I think it should be say

ing with the press everyday and when you get more and more people

then you are going to have one of them trial balloons to [illegible] a banner [illegible]

whole thing will be public and once it has become pub[illegible] it is [illegible] impossible to [illegible]

objectives. Now our city council was not consulted on

fact, to go ground and make full consultation is and to keep [illegible]

d to us too often when we have consulted with o[illegible] [illegible]

start to play one off against the other or [illegible] yet [illegible]

and you can't possibly succeed particularly in [illegible] purchase [illegible]

about it, and it is not a case of honest

Do you mean Mr [illegible] me that the Province [illegible]

of Edmonton without the knowledge of city council?

Mr. BARGEN:

Yes. There were only a few knew about it. That was Mr. Colborne,

the Mayor of Edmonton and Mr. Oryaiuk of A.H.U.R.C.

[illegible] clarify that point [illegible] is easy to see

[illegible] are [illegible] on doing. In any event, I don't

[illegible] for the city of

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Let's put this in its proper context! We purchased this land with the idea of making it available to the city of Edmonton to help solve the problem which both of us are much concerned about. If the city of Edmonton does not choose, we took the risk as to whether or not councillors of the city of Edmonton would go along with the scheme. If they had said no, then we would have to do something else with the land. So let's not have any misunderstanding about that. The city council is definitely not forced to go into this proposition put forward by the provincial government, if they don't want to be in it.

EDMONTON:

I think, Mr. Minister, every one here has got to know something of these things. All city council is desperately aware of the terrible shortage of land and therefore the terrifically high cost of land. We are not here as a matter of fact, nor we shouldn't be here to say - our feelings are hurt---.... There is a lack of housing. It's the truth. It's a social problem here that everyone in this room ought to assume a certain responsibility for it, and our city council did, they assumed it by saying to the administration in our city that we are free to make arrangements. We could not have got this permission three or four years ago before this desperate squeeze for homes in this country. They said to us that we could as a matter of fact go outside our boundaries and make arrangements with another authority and option lands, in other words our city council had already given us a blanket right to do what we could to alleviate the terrible shortage of land for homes. They did not give it to us for industrial development or anything else, and with this particular land, it is quite understood that it is to be for homes and therefore we got the blanket approval of city council to take whatever steps were necessary to do this.

Mr. Colborne)

Let's put this in its proper context! We purchased this land we the idea

if available to the city of Edmonton to help solve the problem which is so

much concerned about. If the city of Edmonton does not choose, we just are not in a

or not councillors of the city of Edmonton would go along with the scheme. If

had said no, then we would have to do something else with the land

about that. The city council is definitely for

put forward by the provincial government, if they

ONTON:

I think, Mr. Minister, every one here

things. All city council is desperately aware of the tenuous

the terrifically high cost of land. We are not

be here to say - our feelings are but---

truth. It's a social problem here that everyone

for it, and our city council only they assumed by applying to the administration

that we are free to make arrangements. We could not have got this permission

four years ago before this desperate squeeze for homes in this country. They said

as a matter of fact go outside our boundaries and make arrangements

in other words our city council had already given

alleviate the terrible shortage of land for homes.

for anything else, and with th

Therefore we just

Just not without their knowledge or consent but they said themselves -- we don't want to know about it specifically, because they do have to be with the press everyday and they know it is going to be wormed out of them they know it is going to destroy our chances of doing this so therefore our city council was quite aware of the power that they had given us and were also aware of the dangers of them having knowledge.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Of course, there is this result, we must all appreciate the concern here, if we are to exercise any controls of the growth of the city, surely one of the ways of doing this is allow lands within the boundary of the city . . . . . somewhere else, economic penalty

if you want to put it. We always try to provide economic within city council and therefore you will get this continual what you are achieving by this interferring with economic factors which would mitigate against growth. That way you are creating growth.

????????

Mr. Minister, you are saying that there is an economic factor that would mitigate against growth. And we are saying, remove the political boundary in some measure and then allow growth to go as it would grow.

?????????

The problem is not the political boundaries so much as the fact as to whether you are serving the land that is available. You have land within the city of Edmonton now that you have not serviced because you thought it was too expensive.

[illegible] without their knowledge or consent but they said [illegible]

[illegible] about it specifically, because they do have to be [illegible] press even [illegible]

[illegible] know it is going to be worried out of them. They know it [illegible] desiring [illegible]

[illegible] of doing this so therefore our city council was [illegible] were in the [illegible] that

given us and were also aware of the de[illegible] s or use [illegible] having [illegible]

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Of course, there is this result, we must all [illegible] some

[illegible] to exercise any controls of the growth of the city, [illegible] we [illegible]

is is allow lands within the boundary of the [illegible] city [illegible] somewhere [illegible]

[illegible] nality

[illegible] you want to put it. We [illegible] are

economic within [illegible] city council and [illegible] are [illegible]

[illegible] this continual what you are achieving

interfering with economic factors which would mitigate against

growth [illegible] Ti of way you are creating [illegible]

Mr. Minister, you are saying that there is an economic factor that would

[illegible] And we are saying, remove the political boundary in some

[illegible] to go as it would grow.

[illegible]

[illegible] undaries so much as the fact as to

[illegible]

Do you propose exact staging and ask for proposals to develop it ... and natural monopoly for a couple of years on these particular periods. You are not going to overcome that problem with one political boundary because you could still have a council in the future which will do exactly the samething again and you will get the same problem . . . The problem of how you go about developing land and the problem of a political solution for the Edmonton area, are two different problems. I think we should not lose track of this. We have got some around us that is undeveloped land. Annexation of this undeveloped land can be as great a problem as the annexation of developed land. And I think perhaps that if the city has proposals about what can they do with annexation of undeveloped land perhaps this will forstall speculation, at least in some areas.

STURGEON:

I was wondering, Mr. Minister, . . . , in view of the observation by the provincial government in assisting the city to acquire this tract of land, without public knowledge, we are assuming that the provincial government, or your department has taken the stand that all future urbanization, and the signs in our society indicate that urbanization will take place at a never increasing rate, we understand that it is the government's position that any urbanization in this area must take place within the boundaries of the city. If this is a government policy decision then I think there is no alternative but to increase the size of Edmonton. However, if this position, is not established as policy, and urbanization is allowed to develop,... . I am speaking of orderly development such as has been proposed by a number of privateconcerns who indicate that they are in a position to provide all services -- in the original instance on dedelopment, I see no real reason why this development necessarily has to be under the administration of the city of Edmonton.

I think if this is the case it does not have to be under the jurisdiction of the city of Edmonton I think we have gone a long way to solving the problem that the city is now faced with inasmuch as they indicate that they had no room for expansion and the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission has followed this policy inasmuch as they have not allowed development outside the city boundary except on 20-acre minimum parcels. Now there is every reason to believe that if this continues, ... remove the boundary, then the same problem exists at that new boundary. I am wondering, I wonder if the city of Edmonton was in a similar position as we find ourselves, if they would then be looking to expand. Now we are in the throes of finding some industrial development in our municipality, and it is close to the city of Edmonton. For a number of years the reason why development has not taken place or why council has not pursued the idea of developing these areas, and is because we are constantly under the threat of annexation by the city of Edmonton. If the city of Edmonton was faced with a similar situation I would suggest they would have just as great a problem developing those areas as we have. There is no way you can spend that kind of money if you are not looking at a long-term venture. As long as you keep moving these boundaries, we lack stability for venture capital. I have no doubt that if these boundaries were moved, it would be good for the city of Edmonton, but it will be at the expense of the surrounding municipalities and I am sure there must be a solution to the thing other than just possibly moving the boundary.

??????????

Mr. Minister, that is why we are here. We would like to make one move and then you would know, for many years where the boundaries of the city are going to be. And it would assist everyone, because you would know the city's boundary.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

I wonder if we can have a response to the question we started with. I think I would have to say that we, as a government, are not bound to the idea that all future urbanization must take place within the boundaries of Edmonton, but by the same token, we are not bound to the idea that no future urbanization is going to take place within the boundaries of Edmonton, but they all must take place outside the boundaries. Our position is somewhere in the middle. We would like to see room for the city's actual contiguous growth to be accommodated. But we are not opposed to see urbanization take place by means of satellite community, or satellite cities, or this type of thing, outside the boundaries of a city. These can be done with good planning.

In working with Mayor Dent, in providing this new land which we hope the city will get for housing, mayalso provide incentive for the developed boundaries. . . . . .

Well, I don't know why, I would just like to, I don't know why, if you assume, I would have to agree that the incentive for satellite cities would be less if you are going to create the situation that we will not allow, we will not provide any place for Edmonton to grow, so that all future growth is forced outside the boundary. The test of our solution is a little way in the future, that is true. We cannot make existing boundaries stick, that is why.

????????

If I may make one comment, I appreciate that this is a very fine suggestion which you made that your position is somewhere in the middle, but from where I sit, I don't think there is any position in the middle, I think you have to have either one position or the other. I don't think there is any room in the middle.

(Mr. Gelborne)

I wonder if we can have a response to the question we started with. I [illegible] I would have to say that we, as a government, are [illegible] that all future urbanization must take place within the boundaries of Edmonton, [illegible] we are not bound to the idea that no future urbanization is going to take place [illegible] the boundaries of Edmonton, but they all must take place outside the boundaries [illegible] position is somewhere in the middle. We would like to see [illegible] contiguous growth to be accommodated. But we [illegible] not [illegible] urban [illegible] areas of satellite community, or satellite cities, [illegible] boundaries of a city. These can be done with [illegible] planning.

In working with Mayor [illegible], in providing this [illegible] we [illegible] will get for housing, we also provide incentive for the development [illegible] boundaries.

Well, I don't know why, I would just like to. I don't know why.

I would have to agree that the incentive for satellite cities would be [illegible] if you are to create the situation that we will not all [illegible], we will not provide any place for [illegible] to grow, so that all future growth is forced outside the boundary. The fact of our little way in the future, that is true. We cannot make existing boundaries [illegible] why.

[illegible] appreciate that this is a very fine suggestion [illegible] the middle, but from where I sit, I don't [illegible] have either one position or [illegible]

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

You are stating the proposition that if Edmonton has any growing room at all, then there is no way in which satellite development can take place. Well this is not true of Calgary today. Calgary has lots of room to grow and yet there is urbanization taking place outside and I am now concerned with assisting the adjacent municipalities in controlling the urbanization and the urbanization which is taking place now. Of course, some of these towns adjacent to Calgary are becoming increasingly dormitory towns for people working in Calgary and living in these towns.

STURGEON:

A few years ago the city of Edmonton annexed from the M.D. of Sturgeon, a slice of property and I think that raises questions too. I would like to make our feeling known.

There is a large tract of land in northeast Edmonton which is under the city of Edmonton at the present time, why is not this being developed. Could I ask this?

EDMONTON:

What are you talking about?

STURGEON:

I am talking about all the land.

EDMONTON:

Well you know right now that we are awaiting a decision of the Regional Planning as to zoning.

(Mr. Cyiborse)

You are stating the proposition that if Edmonton has any growth [illegible] then there is no way in which satellite development can take place. [illegible] Calgary today. Calgary has lots of room to grow and yet there is urban [illegible] place outside and I am now concerned with assisting the adjacent municipalities in [illegible] the urbanization and the urbanization which is taking place now. Of [illegible] of these towns adjacent to Calgary are becoming increasingly [illegible] [illegible] in Calgary and living in these towns.

A few years ago the city annexed from the M.D. [illegible] of property and I think that raises questions too. I would like [illegible]

There is a large tract of land in northeast Edmonton [illegible] at the present time, why [illegible]

What are you talking about?

I am talking about all the land.

[illegible] that we are awaiting [illegible] of the Bog Road

(A mixed discussion here)

STURGEON:

Yes, but it is only a small strip.

EDMONTON:

Oh no, there is a big area out there ready to go. I think they are able to do this, if a boundary should be established. I don't think we should encourage developers right up to that border inside the city. I think we should give a little bit of protection to municipalities outside and in that way we enjoy the same thing with the city of Edmonton. In other words, no matter where the city boundary is, I don't think it is good to develop to it and I don't think your Regional Planning would agree that urbanization should start in Sturgeon from the city's boundary.

MIXED DISCUSSION:

Some of it should be in the city and some of it should be in the municipality .

Mr. Minister, when the Edmonton Regional Planning wants that it will be that, it will appeal it.

That is exactly correct.

I can agree with your philosophy.

EDMONTON:

. . . . . this ring road the Department of Highways is talking of putting around the city, our plans show this. To me, this road becomes a border line between rural and urban development. It is a very big physical break. The exact location of is not exactly chose, but it is chosen on the east side.

(A mixed discussion here)

Yes, but it is only a small city.

Oh no, there is a big area out there ready to go. I think they on ... this, if a boundary should be established. I don't think we should ... right up to that border inside the city. I think we should give ... tion to municipalities outside and in that way we enjoy the same thing with ... In other words, no matter where the city boundary is, I don't think it ... to it and I don't think your Regional Planning would area the urbanization ... ld start in Sturgeon from the city's boundary.

DISCUSSION:

Some of it should be in the city and some of it should be in ...

Mr. Minister, when the Edmonton Regional Planning area ... but it will be ... it will appeal it.

That is exactly correct.

I can agree with your philosophy.

I think a route is not yet chosen as far as the ring road on the west and the south and the north goes. The section that will be dividing us and St. Albert, will be of vital importance. Now I honestly believe that if we go out

He said his people are worrying that are right on the edge. But no matter where that border is he is going to have his problem if his land is just outside the boundary. Those who have been taken into the city by annexation have been treated as farmers in the same way as if they were out in the municipality and so their taxation has been the same.

??????????

Would this land be frozen or could they deal in it or what would they do with it?

???????????

Oh they can buy and sell it, but it will sell naturally as rural land because it is taxed as rural land. I don't think anyone is going to buy it if he considers it as being in the rural category...

????????

I think the point being made by Mr. Menzies was that it still would not stop speculation out there. Speculators could go out there and buy land and of course Dr. Dent answered that by saying that it would grow in another direction, but I am afraid you get headed off at the top here.

Once that border line is divided and either through the action of the government or various governments is concerned, or to the Edmonton District Planning Commission, that there should be a physical break of approximately a mile on either side of the border that does not get industry.

a route is not yet chosen, as far as the ring road on the west and the south and the
roads. The section that will be dividing us and St. Albert, will be of vital importance.
estly believe that if we go out

He said his people are worrying that are right on the edge. But no matter where that border
is he is going to have his problem if his land is just outside the boundary. Those who have
taken into the city by annexation have been treated as farmers i the [illegible] as if if
out in the municipality and so their taxation has been the same.

Would this land be frozen or equal they deal in it or wh

Oh they can buy and sell . but it will still remain [illegible]
is taxed as rural land. I don't think anyone is going to buy it if be considered it being
a rural category ..

I think the point being made by Mr. Moreries was that it still would not
speculation out there. Speculators could go out there and buy land and of course
r. Dent answered that by saying that it would grow in another direction, but I can [illegible]
off of the top here.

[illegible] that bordered [illegible] divided on either [illegible] the south of the
[illegible] to the [illegible] District [illegible]
[illegible] a mile on either side of

ST. ALBERT:

Mr. Minister, being particularly regional here, we have the Bonaventure Industrial Park which now parallels Highway 2 and is going out as far as I understand, to 137th Avenue. Is that correct?

Under the Hanson Report, and this is the only thing I can refer to, St. Albert seems to be the N.W. corner of the city of Edmonton.

?????????

You mean the N.W. corner of the city of Edmonton extends to St. Albert?

?????????

Yes. The industrial sub-division will be extending from the N.W. part of the city. Now under this situation, I happen to live on the south part of the northern part. This means to me that in all probability the industrial park will come up to my back door. Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that I am then going to be living in a second-rate residential district and I take exception that after the amount I paid for my house and the time I put into it, to be placed in that position. Are you prepared, Mr. Menzies, to make a concession to the town of St. Albert that you will leave a mile strip between the industrial part of Edmonton and the town of St. Albert?

Mr. Menzies: Well that is something for which I think we could get a procedure set up whereby we can start with boundaries.

DISCUSSION:

??????????

I would bring to your attention, the northeast Edmonton part, Sir if I might finish, the northeast Section of Edmonton, that we are talking about developing,

the motion to table this thing was put forth and was accepted until we got a reply from the Minister and a reply from the city of Edmonton that the C.I.L. plant, not the C.I.L. plant, the Chemical Plant, in that area would be allowed to expand. I would suggest to you Sir that the answers from both these bodies were not conclusive. Now I am going on the basis of what I have to do to protect my property.

problem is boundaries, whenever you move a boundary, you have the boundary again and you do get the problem, what do you do around that boundary on both sides. I would suggest and I would urge the various municipalities to et and this applies to Edmonton, to consider the matter also as one them that regional government, the boundary is not that effective a loss. But you will have some form of centralized government

we have to cooperate

St. Albert, Fort Saskatchewan

I think we all have to rely on the Saskatchewan basin on this regard. We do have certain problem things which we got to solve in a common way. But if we start drawing these very specific lines, we will get that problem at that line, and this has been through history always the case. If we move that line at the north end of the M.D. of Sturgeon and the east end of Strathcona and at the south end of the County of Leduc, it is so far way that we will be getting into regional situations and I think we have to have a chance to control the things that you really want to control.

MR. MENZIES:

I would draw your attention to this map displaying area information. The heavy black line on the extreme outside is the area that has been suggested to be included for annexation under the Hanson Report. The other fairly significant line, is the proposed ring-road of the Government that the Department of Highways is accumulating land and right-of-way for.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

I wonder if we can just look for a minute at a question that has been raised, and that is that the alternative of regional government to the drawing of new boundaries for the city of Edmonton. Now, for myself, I would have to say that we don't reject entirely the idea of regional government it may be that we may have to come to regional government some time in the future. But if we are going to consider regional government as an alternative I think we are considering something that is going to take a great deal of thought and consideration and consultation with the governments that are affected. And perhaps we should go around the table and get an expression of opinion from the representatives of the various municipalities as to whether or not you think that we ought to be turning to this alternative at this particular time rather than attempting to draw new boundaries.

I would like to hear what the views are. There has been no response to this argument. As I say I don't take the position that regional government is outside the bounds of possibility but I am wondering whether or not if the situation that we at present face is a practical alternative to what we are attempting to do right now.

.....

Well, it would be some sort of government structure that would be superimposed on the existing local government, probably in the whole area we are talking about.

metro type?

because other wise we get duplication and

This is the direction that Ontario has gone and I don't know whether they have proceeded far enough with regional government that anyone could really assess -they have several areas - I know they have. I heard about them recently when meeting the Ontario Minister in Frederiction but I doubtthat they have gone far enough in their experimentation in this kind of government yet to reveal to us whether it is an improvement over what we have already got. It seems to me that we cannot ourselves ignore the case of Calgary where the boundaries were stepped out and that sort of thing to retain one government and although regional government is a solution I can see some problem about following one solution in the Calgary area and a different solution in the Edmonton area.

?????????

Is regional government a form of metropolitan government?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

I question whether it is. I think we can all agree that whatever we do today isn't going to be a solution for all the problems of the future. We will just solve one problem and it will produce a bunch more.

Well, it would be some sort of governmental structure that [illegible] superimposed on the existing local government, probably in the [illegible] about.

metro layer?

because other wise we get duplication and

This is the direction that Ontario has been [illegible] I don't [illegible] both they have proceeded far enough with regional government [illegible] all they [illegible] several areas. I know they have [illegible] board [illegible] the Ontario Minister in Fredericton but I doubt that [illegible] have [illegible] in expe imentation in this kind of government yet to [illegible] over what we have alread[illegible] got. It seems to [illegible] that [illegible] Calgary where the boundaries were stopped [illegible] and although regional government is a solution I [illegible] problem [illegible] solution in the Calgary area and a different solution [illegible]

Regional government a form of metropolitan government?

(Mr. Colborne)

I question whether it is. I think we can all agree that whatever we do [illegible] for all the problems of the future. We will just solve some

EDMONTON:

Mr. Minister, I would like to suggest that we are not in favour of regional government. This is right. The places that have accepted regional government go one step past where we are now and this is my concern and this is why I think that we have to think in terms of statesmen or like statesmen and not always be anxious to keep our own preserve. The regional governments found in other parts of Canada and the United States were formed by circumstances. They became necessary for the overall control of the urban area to set up regional government. There are places or there are people who will say that regional government is just great. They are the people who have somewhat, quite a bit of control over what's done in the governmental area and are usually found in lowly populated portion of the area. The cities of North America that have tried it have found that is not really an answer and the main reason in our country and in the United States is that we do have too much government. The difficulties of a federal state are compounded by the addition of one more level of government and I think that general statement and the literature will back this up as quite valid. It is our experience and we all knew of this where we get into the place where we have to work with three levels of government it is difficult enough now to move ahead and meet society's needs and with the addition of a fourth level of government it becomes all the more difficult. We can take our choice, we can look at this, we can make the mistakes and it will take one hundred years to straighten out the places now that have moved into regional government. The problems surrounding Toronto, Winnipeg are going to take one hundred years to solve, but they were in the unfortunate situation that their municipalities, their urbanized areas, ran one into the other and regionalism therefore became, for them the only solution.

But we are in the situation that we, in the city of Edmonton took over the urbanized areas- - Jasper Place and Beverly - and while we have this circumstance we haven't got this contiguous urbanized area, thus we can move ahead and take the same solution as Calgary did and not have to look at regional government. Of course, I don't mean that we should never look at regional cooperation!

????????

. . . . . And regional planning and working cooperatively together. I think that we have to straighten this up and do a better job than we have been doing in the past. Not the kind of regional government that Winnipeg has been forced to. Which by the way, Winnipeg has been working diligently - their government and their municipalities have been working diligently to . . . . . involved and in doing it by amalgamating the. . . . . near the municipalities under the reach, within the reach, so that they reduce themselves now the number of governmental units in the area of Winnipeg. And Winnipeg is definitely attempting to move towards this solution where they will get away from these. . . . . and will in fact they will get back to what would have been the best solution in the first place had they had the physical situation to . . . . that solution and that was unitary government that we have do that here if we can't avoid the problems of a regional government and I think we can.

CHAIRMAN(Mr. Colborne)

I am sure that there is much to be said on both sides of that question. What I am concerned about is whether or not regional government in its concept offers us an immediate enough solution to the problem which we face now. It seems to me in my

y s are in the situation that we, in the city of Edmonton look over the urbanized areas - Place and Beverly - and while we have this circumstance we haven't got this contiguous ized area, thus we can move ahead and take the same solution as Calgary [illegible] nor have to look at regional government. Of course, I don't mean that we should never look at regional cooperation.

???????

. . . . . And regional planning and working cooperatively together, I think that we have to straighten this up and do a better job than we have been doing in the past. Not the kind of regional government that Winnipeg has been forced to. Which by the way, Winnipeg has been working diligently their government and their municipalities have been working diligently to . . . . involved and in doing it by amalgamating the . . . . near the municipalities under the reach within the reach, so the they reduce now the number of governmental units in the area of Winnipeg. And Winnipeg is entirely attempting to move towards this solution where they will get away from these. . . . . and will in fact they will get back to what would have been the best solution in the first place had they had the physical situation [illegible] . . . . that solution and that was unique government that we have do that here if we can't avoid the problems of a regional government and I think we can.

r. Calbarne)

e that there is much I be said in bet idea question. What

position at Municipal Affairs that I would want to have a lot longer time to consider the alternative to regional government for the province than I think we'll have in looking at this problem. Maybe I am wrong about that but I would like to hear the views of the rest of you now about whether or not we should consider regional government rather than go ahead with an attempt to draw some new proposed boundaries.

????????

. . . . . Mr. Minister, as far as regional government goes I think we have a modified form and I think that it could be expanded planning commission but an answer to Mayor Dent's criticism about it

the only ones I hear that are so adamantly opposed to it

suburbs think it is okay and I think that is

I could mention a city where the centre core would want the control of every thing but if you go down to Winnipeg and talk to some those boys aren't too unhappy and this that is the I get from Toronto it is the centre core that wants

Mr. Minister I don't disagree with that at all. The

of the surrounding communities are

are not and in fact a certain portion of your populated area

satisfied with it. A certain portion of your populus is not. In a few areas where the government is allowed to go out, then your total populus is satisfied with it and

That doesn't follow

(several talking)

Mr. Minister we have got the example and the people living on the Prairie within the boundary are not that dissatisfied. If you take their dissatisfaction and measure it against the people in Winnipeg you find out that the people who are trying to run those cities, the central core portion, are say Calgary or the other cities that have broadened their boundaries so it may not be an absolute evidence

STRATHCONA:

. . . . . Well, Mr. Minister I think there is another matter we should recognize very carefully. It is now about 18 months since the Hanson Report was first published. This is the first time there has been any movement of any kind by or on behalf of the city of Edmonton to discuss the problem with those of us that are affected by it. And the only thing we have before us today in the form of a study is the Hanson Report. Now if you want to talk about regional government as an alternative, I think we have to be frank and say that none of us have studied it to the point we can talk about it. At the same time, I think a good many of us are most concerned with the concept of the Hanson Report and I was glad to hear you say, Mr. Colborne, that if the government is going to look at this problem at all, it is going to look at what you might call the problem but not the Hanson Report. But surely in the matter of this consequence not only in Edmonton but to all these other municipalities, there should have been an approach to the problem and an approach directly to these municipalities followed by a reasonable period of time within these municipalities can look at the problem and say now what in the dickens is the solution. And it is my view, that while many of the gentlemen here are fairly knowledgeable, they have not studied

regional government concepts to any extent. We are talking about something without any detailed study and without any, I would suggest, knowledge of the probable consequence. Mr. Parker has said that in the past the county of Strathcona has on many occasions recognized the need of Edmonton to annex more land in the county and it has assisted the city in that respect. I think I can be permitted quite frankly on behalf of the County that as far as the Hanson approach is concerned, in so far as it affects the industrial area in Sherwood Park we take strong exception to it. We are very much concerned about the industrial area and what is being done to industrial development right now. Consequently while the County has indicated that it is only toowilling to sit down with any, with the other municipalities involved, I think we have got to accept the fact that we are talking about a number of different concepts and we are talking about a question of growth in the manner in which it should be achieved. I do suggest that it is not a very good idea on short notice to simply say "well should we look at the Hanson Report or regional government?", because I don't think that anyone is prepared to go that far at the present time. We can initiate the steps but I think that we may need more information. I think perhaps we should look at annexation for the city of Edmonton of undeveloped areas and that for the longer range we should look towards what are the overall solutions to the problems. And this does require some form of study or commission.

I am not going that far Mr. Parker, I am simply saying that this meeting was called by the Minister to see whether it would be possible to initiate discussions between Edmonton and surrounding municipalities to see which way the population of Edmonton must go.

I am suggesting that the County of Strathcona has said that it is prepared

regional government concepts to any extent. We are talkin

detailed study and without any, I would suggest, knowledge [illegible] the school

[illegible] Mr. Parker has said that in the past it's been [illegible] the

occasions recognized the need of Edmonton to annex more [illegible] in the county. [illegible]

assisted the city in that respect. I think it can be permitted [illegible]

County that [illegible] for as the Hanson approach is concerned in [illegible] it [illegible] an [illegible]

area in Sherwood Park we take strong exception to [illegible] We can [illegible] must [illegible] need

the industrial area and what is being done [illegible] industrial development [illegible] Ze

while the county has indicated that it is only willing

other municipalities involved, I think we have not [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible]

about [illegible] number of different concepts and [illegible] talking

the manner in which it should be [illegible] with.

short notice to simply say "well should we [illegible] be [illegible] you [illegible] I [illegible] government

because I don't think that anyone is prepared [illegible] to go that fa

initiate the steps but I think that we may need more [illegible] I think perhaps

should look at annexation for the city of Edmonton of undeveloped areas [illegible] that for

the longer range we should look towards what are the overall solutions to the problems.

[illegible] this does require some [illegible] of study or commission.

I am not [illegible] at for Mr. Parker, I am simply saying that this meeting

either it would be possible to initiate discussions

way the population is

[illegible] prepared

to sit down and discuss this problem.

As long as we make it clear at the start that we are not starting with the premise of the Hanson Report and what we are discussing as long as Strathcona makes it quite clear that it is extremely concerned over the prospect of further developments on the east and will take a very strong position in that respect. And finally as long as we are looking at these problems, we have a reasonable opportunity to exercise some intelligent judgement in matters such as the alternative of regional government. And I repeat that we are sitting here 18 months after the Hanson Report. I don't intend the remark to be recrimination but the city has never some to Strathcona and I believe not to the other municipalities to initiate these discussions and we seem to be at a starting point and I think we have to take the matter very carefully.

EDMONTON:

Mr. Minister, if I may just respond to this item. I think that as far as that statement is concerned, except for the part that doesn't involve recrimination, that we have from that expression such as we can hope in other words, we wouldn't ask the other municipalities around here to say any more than what has been said. We realize that there are certain places that are going to be defended for this reason and we can understand and appreciate that as long as we can, if we could cover the other municipalities, get the same indication that the acceptance will prove this and that there are certain areas however that we are not going to go towards . . . . . then I think this is fine. Then on the side-issue of not having . . . . . it is very simple. Then we took a look at the Hanson Report we knew that there was a great deal in it that was necessary.

From our view, you are the ones that have to spread out.

EDMONTON:

If we were to hew entirely to the Hanson line say this is where we must go and insist on going, then we realize we are walking into the place where the resistance around is going to be absolute and with good reason. We are quite willing in our discussions to consider the needs of the surrounding areas so that we don't get into a hassle over urbanized areas, be they industrial, or be they residential, unless it is necessary. And therefore we would not ask for any more than the statements that you have made. From our view I think that is as much as we can hope from this meeting.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Could we have Sturgeon's comments.

STURGEON:

Mr. Minister, we are somewhat plagued with the question of understanding something as new as regional government and I think that we must approach it very carefully because we know that unless we take a long view it may not solve what we are to solve. I would like to present . . . . . and this is the, over the period of quite a number of years, the government . . . . . amalgamation of municipalities. . . . . up to the present . . . . . make a municipality . . . . . Then we have . . . . . school . . . . . to make them economical within the boundaries of a municipality and as soon as you change those boundaries to any great extent . . . . . the change of the economical . . . . . .

[illegible] view, you are the ones that have to spread out.

[illegible]

If we were to law entirely to the Hansen lin[illegible], this is wh[illegible] go and insist on going, then we realize we are walking into the place [illegible] resistance around is going to be absolute and with good reason. We are quite willing to our discussions to consider the needs of the surrounding [illegible] so [illegible] we don[illegible] [illegible] house over urbanized areas, be they industrial, or be [illegible] rest[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

We somewhat suggest that when you look at such a map down there you see expansion in certain areas, industry has to go one way it doesn't have to but it is going there now and if we should curtail it from going further in that area, residential is sort of heading towards Sturgeon somewhat and I would be the last one to suggest that there is an area there that would not be economical for residential but it could still be in Sturgeon rather than in the city of Edmonton. Making the boundaries would not necessarily affect it and if the boundaries were to remain - we are all governed under the same Act, we would have the same opportunities to provide all the necessary things that go along with local government to provide the same as if the boundaries had been changed. Changing the boundary doesn't necessarily mean that it is the only solution. I think our main concern is we take a good serious look at the economics of a municipality because it has been a procedure in the past and I think we should continue this procedure in the future. Our municipality has become larger because it is an economic unit and we are now at a point to know whether the city is large enough to be an economic unit or not or whether, it is the municipality that should be larger. Maybe the other approach should be taken, but I think we have to face the fact that economics of a municipality are foremost.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Parkland?

PARKLAND:

Mr. Minister, we still take the same stand that we are ready and willing at any time to sit down with the city of Edmonton to discuss boundary changes and as far as regional government is concerned we will probably have to reserve this - and this must

be thoroughly discussed and I think we have a lot to learn and I think we will hold our reservation on that.

I think, Sir, I might add this about the proposed meeting, it would be fruitful only to the extent that it is entirely clear that there is no club, - that we are free agents to try and arrive at a balance in the interest of the various communities and so on, and that there is no suggestion that if we don't come to terms that something terrible is going to happen.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

I have no threats to make except that we have got to find answer to the problem and we'll have to follow the known alternatives and I don't know what I'd hit you with if I did want to.

Fort Saskatchewan?

FORT SASKATCHEWAN:

Mr. Minister. As you realize Fort Saskatchewan is just slightly outside of these boundaries which you people are talking about, although indirectly the economics of Fort Saskatchewan would be affected by the proposals. One thing that I see in this, is that we are talking about looking down the road to the growth of the city of Edmonton for the next fifteen or twenty years. We are establishing boundaries that will be quite useful for fifteen or twenty years but unless we come up with something different in the way of organization, then we will be right back into the same problem again after the twenty years. We think regional control could be put on this establishment of a growth pattern, either through an imaginary boundary between two

individual governments, surrounding these areas. And unless there is some form of cooperate control with these governments, this thing will see us sitting down here again in fifteen or twenty years! I am not sure, looking at the age group here, whether it will be the same people but it will be the class of representatives. Although Fort Saskatchewan is not directly involved with the boundary, we certainly are directly involved in the economics - we are sitting between two of the municipalities that if they are affected we are.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

St. Albert?

ST. ALBERT:

Mr. Minister, I would like to point out that the former mayor of St. Albert, Mr. Fowler, brought a proposal to the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission, I believe it was in 1967, to have a study done on metropolitan or regional government. I differentiate between the two. I believe a metropolitan type of government is different from regional government. I could be wrong. This motion that was presented to the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission failed and it is my understanding it failed because the city of Edmonton was against the study. The other aspect of it was that the then Mayor Fowler, wished the government to run the study. I have nothing against a study on regional government, I think it might do some good from the point of view of the province in the future. My one problem with the town of St. Albert and a large annexation is that I still feel it will end up as a back water and I submit to you Mr. Minister, that this was never planned to be a back water town.

It is a beautiful town, it is well planned, it is well executed and I cannot invisage the number of people remaining in a town with industry right to the south of it and improper servicing and everything else that will go with immediate annexation as suggested in the Hanson Report.

STRATHCONA:

Well, I wonder if maybe the next step in our discussion should be to determine how we could proceed from this point on. Could I throw out the suggestion that we try to appoint here today, informally, what we might call a Boundaries Commission of some kind with a representative from each of the bodies concerned who might meet sometime in the near future for concrete discussions on boundaries with the objective of trying within the next, what is a reasonable time?, to see if they can get to the place where they would have a set of boundaries that they might be able to bring into a future meeting. Is this a practical suggestion? I think a tone has been set more or less. I think there has been some tone set anyway and I think - I would like to suggest that we be given the opportunity to go back to our councils and discuss what has taken place here today and what the tone really is and come forward with some committee or something. We are a two man committee from the council of seven. They are waiting for us to come back and tell them what transpired here and what the tome of the thing really was. We could have a meeting after the next council meeting or the next meeting after that would even really be a better time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Could we try to avoid duplication, unnecessary duplication of meeting by combining the two ideas - your suggestion and my suggestion. That is to say we ask you to go back from this meeting to report to your respective authorities with the

objective of nominating to me, say one representative from each body to act in some kind of a committee to try to draw suggestions of boundaries that could be considered.

?????????

Yes, but what if we come back and we have another meeting like this and we rehash the whole thing and we end by asking ourselves whether or not we can set up a committee that is going to start drawing some lines.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

I would question whether that would be progress.

?????????

I would suggest two meetings.

?????????

As I read all of this thing there doesn't seem to be very much difference of opinion as between --well, let us leave Edmonton out of it --do we feel that there is any difference opinion as between Sturgeon and Strathcona or Strathcona and Parkland, and so on or does it all boil down basically to a question of whether the City has to go to each one of these individually and talk over the problem as it does affect them.

I wonder if that too might not be a simpler approach.

Have Edmonton . . . . .

If there is a disagreement between two or more of the municipalities, ok, but I don't see much sense to have all of our people sit down here together to discuss a single problem between Edmonton and Strathcona.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

You have a very good point there. The only thing is, I think, at least my current thinking is, unless somebody can change my mind, my current thinking is that I think from having initiated this whole exercise in the first place, I kind of have a feeling that it is important that I have a referee present.

Mr. Minister . . . . . .

(Discussion)

?????????

. . . . . I haven't discussed this with but it would seem to me that we would be better completely in private and without having to think about how we were saying is going to sound to your referee for one thing.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

. . . . . Oh, well . . . . . .I would certainly prefer it if you could each get together with the city of Edmonton and come up with an answer to the problem - that is just about the slickest way of doing it. It is the most desirable from every point of view if possible. In other words, if Strathcona can agree with Edmonton as to where a new boundary would be acceptable, if Sturgeon can agree, but you see here we have the problem of Fort Saskatchewan who aren't really boundary drawing. Maybe . . . Yes, St. Albert is the same, only more so. Maybe the two

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

You have a very good point there. The only thing is, I think, at least my current thinking is, unless somebody can change my mind, a curve thinking is that I think from having initiated this whole exercise in [illegible] have a feeling that it is important that I have a reference pa[illegible]

Mr. Minister.

(Discussion)

???? ????

. . . . . but . . .

but it would seem to me that we would be better [illegible]

having to think about how we were saying it [illegible]

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

. . . . . Oh, well . . . . . I would certainly prefer if you could each get together with the city of Edmonton and come up with an answer to a problem – that is just about the slickest way of doing it. It is the most desirable [illegible] view if possible. In other words, if Strathcona can agree with [illegible] acceptable, if Sturgeon can agree, [illegible] who aren't really concerned [illegible] issue so. Maybe the two

towns could be represented at the time Edmonton's meeting with the municipalities.

EDMONTON:

Certainly the city can meet with each individual council, then also with the town of Fort Saskatchewan and the town of St. Albert. I think that when they have made the final agreement between the two, then we come back as one body and meet again to discuss the overall picture and lay it down on the map and say this is what we have come up with - has the government any other solutions or any other things that they want to add onto the . . . .

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Is that agreeable?

ST. ALBERT:

If I might comment on one aspect of that as it affects St. Albert. It appears to me that from St. Albert's point of view there are three possibilities: either we remain as an independent municipality with our present boundaries, or we are taken over by the city of Edmonton now or sometime in the future, or the town boundaries as they are now are expanded further and we are faced with this third problem right now. There are large land development companies one of which is Bacm which is buying up large quantities of land in the northwest of St. Albert, both inside and outside of the town and it would put us into a different position with the M.D. of Sturgeon as to the boundaries of St. Albert. So with that I think it should take into account the e three possibilities as they affect the town of St. Albert and the question of future enlargement of town boundaries I think also is tied up with the policy that the

towns could be represented on the Town Plan.

EDMONTON:

Certainly the city can do [illegible] with [illegible] initial [illegible]

with the town of Fort Saskatchewan [illegible] the town of

they have made the final agreement [illegible]

meet again to discuss the overall plan [illegible]

what we have come up with [illegible] for the government [illegible]

things that they want to add onto the

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

Is that acceptable?

ST. ALBERT:

[illegible] I'd like comment on [illegible]

appears to me that from St. Albert [illegible] [illegible] Leduc

either we remain as an independent municipality [illegible]

taken over by the city of Edmonton now or annexation [illegible] or [illegible] town

as they are now are expanding further and we are faced with this that problem right

now. There are large land development companies one of which is from [illegible] is

surveying [illegible] large quarter lies of land in the northwest of St. Albert, both inside and

[illegible] town [illegible] it would put us into a different position with the M.D. of

[illegible] with [illegible] I think it should take into

province may come up with an industrial tax. A distinction can be drawn between built up areas and undeveloped areas and the apparently, less objection to annexing the undeveloped areas but I think this is connected with any possible industrial tax or changes in the foundation program. Because the desirability of getting a built-up area, I think is less as the foundation program develops and we get less benefit from the taxes. If you proceed on the basis of enlarging the boundaries but avoiding the built up areas, I think you are going to end up with a very unusual boundary.

From Edmonton's point of view, do you think you could live with the boundary that is now near St. Albert?

EDMONTON:

I think that this is the consideration that you have to give to an agreement although as we have discussed, we are looking for the possibility of expansion but we will not get into conflict with other authorities regarding built up areas, in in other words this is an area in which we are considering giving on.

St. Albert would be happy with the solution that didn't affect your status quo at the present time, just left you with your present boundaries.

ST. ALBERT:

I would point out, Mr. Minister, that this Mayor would be happy with that, I wouldn t say that St. Albert in its entirety would be because as I point out there are differences of opinion on our council. I don't mean that as a solution but as a status quo holding for the present time until others make application for annexation to yourself.

This is not however to say that we would want to exclude that, if they wanted to, in other words we would want them to have a decision making capacity or anything - want to come in and then we would want to be positive in that direction as well. But because St. Albert is concerned here and because Fort Saskatchewan and because this is a total problem, I myself would prefer that we set up as your suggestion, and that people sit down together and th t they look at this thing altogether rather than piecemeal.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

And I personally too would prefer the government play an active role in here in that they give advice and council and sit in on the decisions as well. So I much prefer the first solution that we sit down together.

I would feel the individual discussions are necessary ground work - they have to become . . . . . .

mentioned we did not include

(garbled) about the situation. When I suggested that we have a body set up that would be a line drawing or boundary drawing committee of some kind, I still visualize in my own mind that there would no doubt be discussions take place between the various groups and the city of Edmonton about their particular boundaries as well as sort of a coming together of all of them to consider the total question in each one. Maybe we could do both of these.

?????????

Mr. Minister, with that interruptation

responsibility

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

You do that and then we come together as a body to discuss the overall ramifications of what has been proposed by each.

Now can we set, for our next meeting. My experience of these things is that if we don't set some goals, we can never achieve them. Can we set a deadline on ourselves as to when we are going to - aim at least - to be ready to discuss - how much time do you think will be required to get together with each of these bodies? A month? Too short.

MIXED DISCUSSION:

You are running to a pretty busy month.

That is right too, both this month and next month.

Two months,

.....I think we ought to finalize this when the bells are ringing and they are singing good will to men.

Mr. Minister, ----------

ST. ALBERT:

I would point out, Mr. Minister, that in these - because of St. Albert's unique position, I come back to this again, we have two areas that bound - that come under the town boundaries. One is Parkland and the other is Sturgeon. I particulary, I don't know about the other gentlemen here from my council, but I particularly would be interested in knowing where these suggested boundaries are going to go.

CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Colborne)

You do that and then we come together as a body to discuss the overall consultations of what has been proposed by each.

How can we say, for our next meeting

is that if we don't set such a goals, we can never achieve [illegible] on ourselves as to when we are going to [illegible] at least - in a [illegible] year; [illegible] as much time do you think will be required to [illegible]

A month? Too short.

XEC DISCUSSION:

You are minding to a breath.

That is right too, both. Hi

Two months.

..... I think we ought to [illegible]

they are singing good will to men

Mr. Minister, [illegible]

ST. ALBERT:

I would point out, Mr. Minister, that in there - because of St. Albert's [illegible] position, I come back to this again, we have in [illegible] cross that bound - that come under the town boundaries. One is [illegible] and the other is Sturgeon. I particularly [illegible] here from my council, but particularly [illegible] suggested boundaries are going to go [illegible]

The town of St. Albert should not be involved when they are discussing their boundaries but at least allowed to sit in and keep our mouths shut.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

I certainly think that St. Albert should have an opportunity to look at what Edmonton and those other municipalities are proposing before it becomes too hard and fastened in somebody's mind but surely they can keep the special problem and the special attitude re St. Albert when they are dealing with these things and consult with St. Albert on those boundaries. Can you do that?

EDMONTON:

Mr. Minister, if we inform everybody, all representatives of our schedules and appointments for these meetings, -- then any interested municipality would be welcome to send their representative along to sit in on the discussions.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

That would be a good idea. Can we settle on that?

Gentlemen, I thank you very much. We aim for January 15?

EDMONTON:

There is one point, this has been a relatively private meeting I don't know whether the newspapers are interested in it or not, but if so who is to talk to them?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Well, I think, I was going to make the suggestion - but we may as well discuss it now. My first suggestion would be that each of you be guided by your own opinions on the matter, and say whatever you please to the press.

It doesn't matter to me, as long as you know that our objective is till the same, we still have hopes that we can come up with an answer to the problem and we aim for some time in January that we can.

????????

. . . . . The radio announced this meeting this morning, so obviously I imagine that they will be contacting you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

They were asking me just as I came in here, when we expect to be finished except that I expected to be finished this morning.

Well, I have to make some kind of statement to them anyhow and I'll be glad to do that, but I don't think that we should muzzle anyone who wants to express a point of view, I think we are all adult and mature people who should be able to - you have all dealt enough with the press to know all the pitfalls, anyway.

8th of January, how does that sound?

(discussion)

Yes, we are trying to do that.

(discussion)

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Well, let us leave it that we'll meet sometime in January, and then as I get progress reports maybe I can be responsible for setting a date after we know where we stand.

It doesn't matter to me, as long as you know that our objective is still the same, we have hopes that we can come up with an answer to the problem and we can for some time in January that we can.

????? ?????

. . . . The table measured this [illegible] among [illegible] I imagine that they will be contention [illegible] you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

They were asking me just on [illegible] here, [illegible] to be [illegible] except that I expected to [illegible] relaxed a [illegible] normal [illegible]

Well, I have to make [illegible] of arrangement to [illegible] anyone [illegible] and I'll be glad to do that, but I don't think that we should [illegible] anyone who wants to express a point of view. I think [illegible] all [illegible] people who would be able to – you have all dealt enough with [illegible]

8th of January, or [illegible] then the [illegible]

(discussion)

Yes, we are trying to do that.

(discussion)

(Mr. Colborne)

Well, let us leave it that we'll meet sometime in January, and that as I [illegible] maybe I can be responsible for setting a date after we know where [illegible]

Somebody suggested the 8th of January, is that a good date? . . . . . What day of the week is that? That sound all right? We can always change that date if it looks like we can't make it. Let's aim for January 8th. Is that okay?

Here general murmur of agreement.

?????????

Mr. Chairman, we'll let you know about the location, ...

Can we receive a transcript of this meeting?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Well, there is a good question, we could have that transcribed couldn't we? I always like to read things that are transcribed from this kind of conversation and it sure comes out funny. You don't speak in sentences you know I find that when I start reading. You speak in ideas and little phrases and things. I'll have it transcribed and send a copy to each municipality.

. . . .

We do not have speakers identified on the tape. I trust each of you will know from your own knowledge of this meeting, how to ascribe the statements expressed.

?????????

I think so.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Colborne)

Thank you gentlemen, very much.

LEGISLATURE LIBRARY
216 LEGISLATURE BUILDING
EDMONTON, ALBERTA